

MAY 26 1948

VOLUME XLIII

PERIODICAL ROOM
GENERAL LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN
NUMBER 2

April 1948

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

A Quarterly Journal devoted to re-
search in the Languages, Literatures,
History, and Life of Classical Antiquity

THE UNIVERSITY *of* CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, U.S.A.

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

EDITORS

JAKOB A. O. IARSEN, *Managing Editor*
JOHN PHILIP COOKE, *Assistant Editor*

CHARLES HENRY BEESON
BLANCHE BEATRICE BOYER
RICHARD TREAT BRÜERE

CARL DARLING BUCK
PHILLIP HOWARD DE LACY
BENEDICT EINARSON
FRANKLIN P. JOHNSON

RICHARD F. McKEON
RALPH MARCUS
GERTRUDE SMITH

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

HAROLD F. CHERNISS, *University of California*
GEORGE LINCOLN HENDRICKSON, *Yale University*
BEN EDWIN PERRY, *University of Illinois*

RODNEY POTTER ROBINSON, *University of Cincinnati*
DOM ANSELM STRITTMATTER, *St. Anselm's Priory*
LILLY ROSS TAYLOR, *Bryn Mawr College*

VOL. XLIII

CONTENTS FOR APRIL 1948

No. 2

The Settlements of Philip II with the Greek States in 338 B.C.	Carl Roebuck	73
Pagan Examples of Fortitude in the Latin Christian Apologists	Mary Louise Carlson	93
Propertius and Horace	Friedrich Solmsen	105
The Indiana University Papyri	Verne B. Schuman	110
Notes and Discussions		116

CHARLES EDSON: Philip V and Alcione of Messene.

Book Reviews

122

WILFRED L. KNOX: *Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity* (Nock).—E. K. RAND et al. (eds.): *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II* (Brüere).—HANS HER-
TER: *Platons Akademie* (Cherniss).—JAMES HUTTON: *The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers
of the Netherlands to the Year 1800* (Oliver).—W. H. S. JONES: *Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece:
With an Edition of Iliet ἀπαισι τυρπύσι* (Couch).—FELIX HEINMANN: *Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und
Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts* (Greene).—REINHOLD STREUMBERG:
Greek Prefix Studies: On the Use of Adjective Particles (Foultney).—ANDRÉ AYMER: "A propos de quelques
monnaies romaines du musée Saint-Raymond," etc. (Larsen).—POUL JOHANNES JENSEN: *Det latinske Per-
fekt-system* (Whatmough).—SIGMUND SKARD: *The Use of Color in Literature: A Survey of Research* (Pease).—
MARCUS N. TOD: *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.*, 2d ed.
(Larsen).—CHARLES DELVOYE: *Bibliographie archéologique pour les professeurs de langues et d'histoire an-
ciennes* (Johnson).

Books Received

143

Classical Philology is published quarterly in the months of January, April, July, and October, by the University of Chicago at the University of Chicago Press, 5750 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, Illinois. The subscription price is \$6.00 per year; the price of single copies is \$1.75. Orders for service of less than a full year will be charged at the single-copy rate. Postage is prepaid by the publishers on all orders from the United States and its possessions, Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Guatemala, Haiti, Republic of Honduras, Mexico, Morocco (Spanish Zone), Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Rio de Oro, El Salvador, Spain (including Balearic Islands, Canary Islands, and the Spanish Offices in Northern Africa; Andorra), Spanish Guinea, Uruguay, and Venezuela. Postage is charged extra as follows: For Canada and Newfoundland, 16 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.16), on single copies, 4 cents (total \$1.79); for all other countries in the Postal Union 40 cents on annual subscriptions (total \$6.40), on single copies, 10 cents (total \$1.85). Patrons are requested to make all remittances payable to the University of Chicago Press in United States currency or its equivalent by postal or express money orders or bank drafts.

The following are authorized agents:

For the British Empire, except North America, India, and Australasia: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS, Bentley House, 200 Euston Road, London, N.W. 1, England. Prices of yearly subscriptions and of single copies may be had on application.

Claims for missing numbers should be made within the month following the regular month of publication. The publishers expect to supply missing numbers free only when losses have been sustained in transit and when the reserve stock will permit.

Business correspondence should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, Chicago 37, Ill.

Communications for the editors and manuscripts should be addressed to the Editor of Classical Philology, Box M, University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. All manuscripts must be typed, double spaced—both texts and notes—with ample margins on firm paper (not onion-skin, etc.).

The articles in this journal are indexed in the International Index to Periodicals, New York, N.Y.

Applications for permission to quote from this journal should be addressed to The University of Chicago Press, and will be freely granted.

Entered as second-class matter June 20, 1906, at the post-office at Chicago, Illinois, under the Act of August 24, 1912.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in United States Postal Act of October 3, 1917, Section 1103, amended February 28, 1925, authorized June 6, 1918.

PRINTED IN THE U.S.A.

r
i
2
3
3
5
9
3
2

C

V

r

G
H
qu
pr
th
a
m
up
ju

m
co
Cl
rel
rel
ô
As
ste
so
At
th
be
th
rel
ga
Ac
ca
om
me
th
Ar
mi
Gr
lis
in
th
At

[C]

CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

Volume XLIII

APRIL 1948

Number 2

THE SETTLEMENTS OF PHILIP II WITH THE GREEK STATES IN 338 B.C.

CARL ROEBUCK

THE purpose of this article is to examine one phase in the extension of the Macedonian hegemony over Greece—the settlements made by Philip II with individual Greek states as a sequel to the war of 340–338 B.C. and as a preliminary step to the establishment of the League of Corinth. "Settlements" is a somewhat inexact term; for, while Philip made formal treaties with his enemies upon their surrender,¹ he gave certain adjustments in favor of his allies a different

¹ The most complete statement about the treaties made by Philip with members of the hostile Athenian coalition is that of Aelian (*Var. hist.* vi. 1): after Chaeronea, the Greeks, in terror of Philip, *ἐαυτοὺς κατὰ πόλεις ἐνεχείρισαν αὐτῷ φέροντες*. καὶ τοῦτό γε ἔδρασαν Θηβαῖοι καὶ Μεγαρεῖς καὶ Κορίνθιοι καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ καὶ Ἥλαιοι καὶ Εὐβοεῖς καὶ οἱ ἐν τῇ Ἀκτῇ πάντες. οὐ μὲν ἐφίλαξε τὰς πρὸς αὐτοῖς ὁμολογίας δὲ Φιλίππος, ἀλλ' ἐβουλόσατο πάντας, ἑδῖκα καὶ παρόνομα δρῶν. As well as expressing a view very hostile to Philip, the statement contains one mistake, some inaccuracies, and some possible omissions. Elis was not a member of the Athenian coalition but had an alliance with Philip, although it had not sent aid to him at Chaeronea (see below, n. 18). Thus it should scarcely be included in this list. The Greeks are said to have surrendered *κατὰ πόλεις*, and three cities are mentioned: Thebes, Megara, and Corinth; then two league organizations: the Achaeans and the Euboeans; and, finally, a geographical expression: all those on Akte. The most obvious omission would seem to be Athens (others are the members of the Athenian confederacy; the cities of the Boeotian League; Leucas; Corcyra; Acarnania; Ambracia; Cephallenia [see below, n. 16]). These might be included in the general reference to the Greeks, but the writer's *γὰρ* seems to indicate a definite list copied from his source. It is possibly implied that, in the case of the omitted states, Philip himself took the initiative in opening negotiations, as he did with Athens. Certainly, this view should not be pressed. In

legal basis, making use of the Amphictyonic Council² and the new League of Corinth.³ Our knowledge of these settlements is very scanty, for none survives in documentary form. Only in the case of Athens has it been possible to reconstruct the full procedure of negotiation and treaty-making.⁴ Generally speaking, it may be said that the separate settlements molded the individual units of Greece with which Philip was preparing to deal collectively through the League of Corinth; but what part did they play in the establishment of the League? For instance, Hampl has suggested⁵ that the treaties of settlement were

any case the phrase *κατὰ πόλεις* apparently indicates that the separate units of the Athenian coalition made separate settlements, i.e., that Philip did not make a general settlement with the coalition as a whole and that he did make settlements with its individual units, whether they were city-states, like Megara, or federal-league organizations, like the Achaeans.

² In the case of Phocis and Locris (see pp. 77 f.).

³ In the adjustment made between Sparta, Argos, Messene, and Arcadia (see pp. 88 f.).

⁴ A. Schaefer, *Demosthenes und seine Zeit* (2d ed.; Leipzig, 1887), III, 20–29.

⁵ F. Hampl, *Die griechischen Staatsverträge des 4. Jahrhunderts v. Christi Geburt* (Leipzig, 1938), p. 52. Hampl considered that the League was based on a *koine eirene* only and made no provision for the relationships of a *symmachia*. Accordingly, he has suggested that certain evidence (Arrian *Anabasis* ii. 1. 4; Diod. xvii. 63. 1) of alliances between Philip and individual Greek states refers to the alliances made by Philip at various times before the congress of Corinth, in particular, to the separate treaties made just after Chaeronea.

also alliances binding the separate states to Philip; if, however, the League itself was a symmarchy,⁶ which seems correct, that procedure would have been unnecessary. Some evidence, however, has been found for it in the Athenian settlement. Then, as is well known, the League treaties guaranteed the constitutions which the member-states had at the time of their entrance into the League. Philip is usually credited with an attempt to arrange governments friendly to himself in the Greek states. Was this provided for by the separate treaties, as Schwahn has implied?⁷ Finally, many boundary revisions were made after Chaeronea. It has been suggested by Treves in specific connection with those in the case of Sparta: "The Hellenic League had obviously both the task of demarcating and the authority to guarantee the new boundaries. To that end, Aristotle, as is well known, . . . drew, at Philip's request, the *δικαιώματα* of the Greek states. The symmarchy thereby legalized the *status quo*."⁸ If we may ex-

⁶ For the establishment and organization of the League see, in particular, the articles of U. Wilcken, "Beiträge zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes," *Sitzungsber. München*, 1917, pp. 1-40; "Alexander der Grosse und die korinthische Bund," *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1922, pp. 97-118; "Über eine Inschrift aus dem Asklepieion von Epidauros," *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1922, pp. 122-47; "Zu der epidaurischen Bundesstele vom J. 302 v. Chr.," *ibid.*, 1927, pp. 277-301; "Philip II von Makedonien und die panhellenische Idee," *ibid.*, 1929, pp. 297 ff.; J. A. O. Larsen, "Representative Government in the Panhellenic Leagues," *CP*, XX (1925), 313-29, XXI (1926), 52-71. For more recent treatments see W. Schwahn, "Zu IG, II, 160 (Philipps Landfrieden)," *Rh. Mus.*, LXXVIII (1929), 188-98; *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede Philipps von Makedonien*, *Klio*, Beiheft XXI (N.F. VIII [1930]), 1-63; F. Schehl, "Zum korinthischen Bund vom Jahre 338/37 v. Chr.," *Jahreshefte*, XXVII (1932), 115-45; A. Momigliano, "La κοινὴ εἰρήνη dal 386 al 338 a.C.," *Riv. fil.*, LXII (1934), 487-514; Hampl, *op. cit.*, pp. 34-56; these are primarily concerned with the question whether the League is to be defined as a *koine eirene* or a *symmarchia*. As Larsen, however, has pointed out, the organization is referred to as a *symmarchia* in an inscription (review of Hampl, *CP*, XXXIV [1939], 378).

⁷ *Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede*, pp. 36-38.

⁸ P. Treves, "The Problem of a History of Messenia," *JHS*, LXIV (1944), 102-6 at 105. I had already attempted to reconstruct the adjustment made between Sparta, Argos, Messene, and Arcadia (*A His-*

tend this to the territorial revisions in general, it implies that ownership of territory would have been stated in principle in the separate settlements but that a point-by-point demarcation and ratification would have been made by the League on the expert advice of Aristotle's treatise. These are some of the questions of procedure and practice which arise from a consideration of the problem of the settlements; but there are also matters of more general interest.

Philip designed the League of Corinth to conduct the affairs of Greece in a peaceable, legal fashion under his hegemony and that of his successors.⁹ At the second session of the League in 337 B.C., he was elected commander-in-chief to lead this united Greece against Persia.¹⁰ If such an organization was to function efficiently, Philip had to remove at the outset, as best he could, the causes of strife between various states and to insure the support of his plans by their citizens and governments. For that, more than the documents calling the League into existence would have been necessary. The groundwork had been laid by a decade of propaganda,¹¹ designed to win the good will of the Greeks, so that in every state, with the exception

tory of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C. [Dissertation, Chicago, 1941], pp. 53-57; but, as Dr. Treves kindly pointed out in a letter, the problem needed a fuller consideration of the evidence. Since that time his criticisms have been published in the note mentioned above. The significance of the *dikaiomata* in Philip's settlements is discussed by H. Nissen ("Die Staatschriften des Aristoteles," *Rh. Mus.*, XLVII [1892], 168-71) and mentioned incidentally in a discussion of Philip's personality by A. Momigliano (*Filippo il Macedone* [Florence, 1934], pp. 134-35); see also below, appendix.

⁹ J. A. O. Larsen, "Federation for Peace in Ancient Greece," *CP*, XXXIX (1944), 160-61.

¹⁰ Wilcken, *Sitzungsber. München*, 1917, pp. 25-28, and *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1929, pp. 309-10; but see Hampl, *op. cit.*, p. 46, n. 1.

¹¹ For a discussion of Philip's propaganda see, in particular, E. Bickermann and J. Sykutris, "Speusippos Brief an König Philipp," *Ber. sächs. Akad. d. Wiss. Phil.-hist. Kl.*, LXXX (1928), 20 ff.; Wilcken, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1929, pp. 310 ff.

of Sparta,¹² there was a substantial group of Macedonian partisans, some by conviction, others by self-interest. The treaties which brought the League into existence set forth the principles of the organization and provided for its functioning;¹³ but there was in them no mention of the penalties, rewards, and adjustments which Philip had to make in accordance with his general plans for Greece and which were necessitated by his own actions and those of the Greek states before Chaeronea. These would have found their proper place in the separate settlements, which should thus have offered Philip a means of removing the trouble-spots which were deemed harmful to the new league. Thus an examination of the separate settlements should also have its place in a general estimate of Philip's quality as a statesman. How did he use the opportunity?

In making the settlements, Philip had to take into account the results of the diplomatic and military activity of the years before Chaeronea—the alignments, alliances, and shifts of alliance, which gave various states claim to his good will or offered cause for punitive action. Not all the Greek states had taken part in the war of 340–338 B.C.; some had participated actively on Philip's side; and some were members of the Athenian coalition opposed to him, while others had remained inactive,

prudently waiting on events. Philip's own allies, who co-operated in the campaign of 339/8 B.C., were Thessaly, Epirus, and Aetolia.¹⁴ To them, in the course of the campaign, were added northern Phocis and the Epicnemidian Locrians.¹⁵ The opposing states were Athens and the remnants of the Second Confederacy; the Boeotian League, headed by Thebes; the Euboean League; the Achaean League; Corinth; the towns on Akte; Megara; Leucas; Coreyra; Acarnania; Ambracia; Cephallenia; Amphissa; southern Phocis.¹⁶

¹⁴ Philip had strengthened his control of Thessaly in 344 B.C. by taking the position of *archon* and had weakened the unity of the state in 342 B.C. by the creation of the tetrarchies. Thessaly had benefited, however, by the restoration of its traditional prestige at Delphi and by its strong representation in the college of *naopoioi* there (see n. 38). In 343 B.C. Aetolia had been won over by Philip, who had established his brother-in-law, Alexander, as king in Epirus, allowing the latter an extension of territory in Chaonia (Pickard-Cambridge, *CAH*, VI, 248–49).

¹⁵ Philip apparently found it useful to establish good relations with the Epicnemidian Locrians and northern Phocis for the better conduct of the campaign of 339/8 B.C. (G. Glotz, "Philippe et la surprise d'Elatie," *BCH*, XXXIII [1909], 530–41). The Opuntian Locrians presumably would be already pro-Macedonian, as they had benefited by the settlement of 346 B.C. (*ibid.*, p. 531).

¹⁶ The sources contain several lists of members of the anti-Macedonian coalition, won over by Demosthenes in 343/2 or in 340 B.C., when the "Hellenic League" was formed. Demosthenes himself in the speech *On the Crown* (xviii, 237) claimed the Euboeans, Achaeans, Corinthians, Thebans, Megarians, Leucadians, and Coreyrians (Plutarch seems to have copied this list in his *Vita Demosthenis* 17). In the *Vitae decem oratorum* (851b) a list is given which omits the Leucadians and Coreyrians but adds the Locrians, Byzantines, and Messenians. The list is part of a quoted decree, honoring Demosthenes and giving a general account of his services to the state; but the inclusion of Messene is either a mistake or indicates that the reference must be taken as a reminiscence of the Messenian-Athenian alliance of 342 B.C. (*IG*, II², No. 225; Roebuck, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–52). There is no further evidence concerning the Locrians, but it may be assumed that Amphissa is meant, so that its presence on the Athenian side is reasonable (Oldfather, P.-W., XIII, 1211); the same probability would hold good for Byzantium (on the authenticity of the decree see Ladek, "Über die Echtheit zweier auf Demosthenes und Demochares bezüglichen Urkunden in Pseudo-Plutarchs *Bios τῶν δέκα ῥητόρων*," *Wiener Studien*, XIII [1891], 99 ff.). The other lists, found in *Vitae decem oratorum* (845a) and in Pseudo-Lucian (*Dem. enc.* 38) are of a general nature, citing only some of those states mentioned in the list in the speech *On the Crown*. The passages in Aeschines (iii, 94–98) record-

¹² Paus. vii, 10, 3; Sparta's resistance to Philip's demands and its abstention from the League are, perhaps, a better indication.

¹³ Wilcken, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1929, pp. 299 ff. The main evidence for the content of these treaties is the speech of Pseudo-Demosthenes (xvii), written ca. 330 B.C. by an anti-Macedonian; the fragmentary inscription (Ditt. *Syll.*³, No. 260), which has been emended in accordance with the views of the various scholars dealing with the League (Wilcken, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1929, pp. 316–18; Schwahn, *Rh. Mus.*, LXXVIII [1929], 188; Schehl, *op. cit.*, pp. 141 ff.); the document from Epidaurus containing the treaty of the League of Demetrius and Antigonus founded in 302 B.C. (*IG*, IV², 1, 68). The sources are discussed by H. O. Raue, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte des korinthischen Bundes* (Dissertation, Marburg, 1937), pp. 3–8.

Athens and Thebes were the most powerful members of this coalition, but the others had sent contributions of men and money or had indicated their adherence. Of the "neutral" states, Argos, Arcadia, and Messene seem to have had alliances with both Athens and Philip¹⁷ but had a claim on Philip's patronage by their pro-Macedonian activity in 344/3 B.C. and a convenient excuse for not sending aid to Chaeronea in the blocking of the Isthmus by Corinth and Megara. Elis did not take part at Chaeronea but had an alliance with Philip and showed its sincerity, at least after the event, by joining him in the invasion of Laconia in the autumn of 338 B.C.¹⁸ Sparta itself, since Philip had checked its encroachments on its neighbors in 344 B.C., had withdrawn almost entirely from Greek affairs. With these political alignments in mind, let us turn to the examination of the settlements.¹⁹

WESTERN GREECE

In western Greece, Philip evidently considered that Ambracia was the key point for insuring his control over the region. It offered access to the Ionian Sea from Macedonia and formed a wedge of territory between Epirus, Aetolia, and Acarnania, from which an eye might be kept on them. Accordingly, in 343/2 B.C.

ing the purported contributions of the members of the "Hellenic League" add the Acarnanians and all the Peloponnesians; but Acarnania seems to have been divided in loyalty (see below, n. 21), and Demosthenes specifically excepted Arcadia, Argos, and Messene (xviii. 64), while Elis (see n. 18) and Sparta are known to have been inactive at Chaeronea; the towns on Akte surrendered to Philip after Chaeronea (Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1; Lycurgus *Leoc.* 42), so that they presumably belonged to the Athenian coalition. Since Athens and Thebes occupied southern Phocis before Chaeronea, the inhabitants would perforce have had to aid them (Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 539-40). Ambracia and Cephallenia may be added, from our general knowledge of the situation in western Greece (Glotz-Cohen, *Histoire grecque* [Paris, 1936], III, 324, 332).

¹⁷ Roebuck, *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.

¹⁸ Dem. ix. 27, xviii. 295; Paus. v. 4. 9; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 322-23, 331-32.

Philip had developed a claim through the convenient, if legendary, activity of his Heraclid ancestors and had made preparations to occupy the country.²⁰ At that time, however, Athens had succeeded in preventing Philip's invasion by sending a force to Ambracia and gaining the support of Acarnania and the large islands in the Ionian Sea.²¹ After Chaeronea, Philip was in a position to make good his claim. A garrison was placed in Ambracia,²² while, in Acarnania, Philip's partisans apparently came into control so that the pro-Athenian leaders were forced to take refuge in Athens.²³ If Philip had already laid claim to Ambracia as part of his hereditary possessions, he might have administered the district through the garrison commander or, more probably, have de-

¹⁹ I shall discuss only the settlements made with the states of the Greek mainland. The conventional chronology for the year 338/7 B.C. is followed. For convenience it may be summarized: autumn, winter, and spring, 339/8—the adjustments with Phocis and Locris; late August, 338—the battle of Chaeronea; September-October, 338—the settlement of western and central Greece and the negotiations with Athens; end of October, 338—the treaty with Athens; November-December, 338—the Peloponnesian settlements; winter, 337—the first meeting of the League of Corinth; spring, 337—the second meeting of the League of Corinth (see Wilcken, *Sitzungsber. München*, 1917, pp. 23-24, *Sitzungsber. Berlin*, 1929, p. 299; Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 530-41; P. Cloché, "Les Naopes de Delphes et la politique hellénique de 356 à 327 av. J.-C.," *BCH*, XL [1916], 131-32; Beloch, *Gr. Gesch.*, III, 2 [2d ed.; Berlin-Leipzig, 1923], 298-99.

²⁰ Bickermann and Sykutris, *op. cit.*, pp. 22, 29 ff.; there is some controversy about the date of Philip's attempt on Ambracia (Dem. vii. 32, ix. 27, x. 10; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 322, 324).

²¹ Dem. ix. 34, xviii. 244; for discussion and further evidence see F. R. Wüst, *Philipp II von Makedonien und Griechenland* (Leipzig, 1938), p. 94, n. 1. Although Acarnania is said to have been responsible for a contribution of 2,000 hoplites to the forces of the "Hellenic League" of 340 B.C. (Aesch. iii. 97-98), its name is not included in the lists of Athenian allies, so that it is reasonable to assume that the state did not officially join the coalition but sent only volunteers (Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 119, n. 2).

²² Diod. xvii. 3 (335 B.C.); after dislodging the garrison placed there by Philip, the Ambraciotes established a democracy.

²³ Diod. xvii. 3; Ditt., *Syll.*, No. 259; two of them, Phormion and Karphinas, were granted the right to exercise their hereditary citizenship, and others were allowed to reside in Athens.

pendent on an oligarchy of his own adherents. We have no evidence of what happened in the islands of Corcyra, Leucas, and Cephallenia; but there, too, Philip's partisans probably would assume control and send their political opponents into exile.

In the case of Philip's allies, Epirus had already been enlarged in 342 B.C. by an extension of territory in Chaonia. The Aetolians, however, in return for their co-operation, had apparently asked for Naupactus,²⁴ which was in the possession of the Achaean League.²⁵ Philip, after he had occupied Delphi in the spring of 338 B.C., took the city, despite the resistance of the Achaean garrison, and proceeded to award it to Aetolia.²⁶ Its loss would form one of the terms of the later settlement with the Achaean League,²⁷ but the account of Strabo mentions an adjudication by Philip which probably decided between the Aetolian claims and those advanced by the western Locrians, who would estimate the moment favorable, at least for stating their position.²⁸ Thus, in western Greece, Philip completed the plans entered upon in 343 B.C. to insure his hold on the district, but he did so without unduly increasing the power of any one of his allies there.

CENTRAL GREECE

Philip had, in 346 B.C., secured a voice for himself in the affairs of Greece in general and of central Greece in particular by

²⁴ Dem. ix. 34.

²⁵ *Ibid.*; Theopompus, Frag. 235 (Jacoby, *Frag. gr. Hist.*).

²⁶ Strabo ix. 4. 7 (427); Theopompus, Frag. 235; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 359.

²⁷ See below, pp. 83 f.

²⁸ Strabo ix. 4. 7 (427); Oldfather, *op. cit.*, p. 1214. Strabo's expression, Φιλίππου προσκληναι, would seem to indicate that Philip had to make a decision on conflicting claims. Since Naupactus had been captured from the enemy and since each of the claimants was allied to Philip, it is unlikely that he would refer the matter to the League of Corinth, as he did later in the case of Sparta (see appendix).

championing the Delphic oracle in the Sacred War and, at its conclusion, by taking for Macedonia the two seats of Phocis on the Amphictyonic Council. Thebes, however, by its control of the Boeotian League, had been in a position to exercise a preponderating influence in central Greece and had looked with increasing hostility and suspicion on Philip's encroachment. Although he had sought to work with Thebes, such an arrangement proved impossible. Thus, if central Greece was to be quiescent, the power of Thebes would have to be destroyed.²⁹ This meant a reduction of its influence and an increase in that of the other cities to make a more equable balance. While this and the establishment of pro-Macedonian governments would go far to insure the Macedonian hegemony, Philip, as in western Greece, took the extra precaution of installing a Macedonian garrison and further strengthening the influence of Delphi and of the Amphictyonic Council, of which he had demonstrated his control in the incident of Amphisssa.

Philip's policy seems to have been inaugurated in the autumn and winter of 339/8 B.C.; for, during that time, Phocis, of which he had occupied the northern part, was granted concessions which went far to restore it as a potential makeweight to Thebes. In 346 B.C. the Amphictyonic Council had thoroughly crippled Phocis: its towns were destroyed and the inhabitants organized into villages, a heavy indemnity of sixty talents per annum imposed, and the Phocian League, if it survived at all, reduced to little more than an agency for the collection of the indemnity.³⁰ The Phocians had made payments in half-yearly instalments of thirty talents from the autumn of 343 until the

²⁹ J. Kaerst, *Geschichte des Hellenismus* (3d ed.; Leipzig, 1927), I, 263-64; Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 169.

³⁰ Diod. xvi. 60; Busolt-Swoboda, *Griechische Staatskunde* (Munich, 1926), pp. 1448-49.

spring of 338 B.C.; but after that date the sum was reduced to ten talents paid annually, as the payment of that amount in the spring of 337 B.C. indicates.³¹ About the same time, the rebuilding of the towns and their fortifications—an indication of sovereignty—was commenced,³² and it seems likely that the League organization was restored to its former position.³³ In Phocis, as elsewhere, Philip's partisans would have taken advantage of the situation and the popular appeal of the concessions to consolidate their control of the government.³⁴ As the penalties had originally been imposed by the Amphictyonic Council, its decisions would have been necessary to modify them, so that it may be supposed that Philip would have had the concessions made by the Council in the autumn of 339 B.C.

The Council had also weakened Epicnemidian Locris in 346 B.C. by bestowing the important fortress of Nicaea upon the

Thessalians, by whom it was garrisoned until Philip decided that it was safer in Macedonian hands (probably in 342 B.C.). In the summer of 339 B.C., however, Nicaea had been captured by the Thebans.³⁵ Accordingly, Philip proposed, when soliciting the alliance from Thebes in 338 B.C., that it be restored to its rightful owners, the Epicnemidian Locrians, whose cooperation he had apparently engaged by the promise of its return. Although, since the Thebans refused the alliance, this could not have been carried out until after Thebes was defeated, there is no reason to suppose that it was not done, as Nicaea had lost its strategic importance after Philip occupied Elateia. Philip, as general for the Amphictyonic League, would have been able to make the offer; but the final reversion would depend on the decision of the Council,³⁶ taken possibly in the autumn of 339 B.C. It is perhaps significant in this connection that the delegate from east Locris (although an Opuntian) to the Delphic board of *naopoioi*, was absent in the autumn of 339 B.C. but returned to the meeting held in the autumn of 338 B.C.³⁷

Philip had made his influence felt in the Delphian organization not so much

³¹ Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 528-30.

³¹ Ditt. *Syll.*³, No. 230; Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 537-38; E. Bourguet, *Fouilles de Delphes*, Vol. III, Part V, "Les Comptes du IV^e siècle," p. 63.

³² Paus. x. 3. 3, 33. 8, 36. 3. Pausanias ascribes the rebuilding of the Phocian towns to the aid of the Athenians and Thebans before the battle of Chaeronea and implies that the Phocians themselves took part in the battle on the Athenian side. The statement, however, can be true only for the fortifications of the towns in the area occupied by the Athenians and Thebans—north and east of Mount Parnassus. Philip presumably allowed reconstruction in his area of occupation and permitted it to continue throughout Phocis after the battle (Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 39; Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 538-41; Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 573, n. 4; Momigliano, *Filippo*, p. 157, n. 1).

³³ The inscription (Ditt. *Syll.*³, No. 231) dated 342/1 B.C. mentions one Phocian *archon* from Medeon and four Phocian witnesses without mention of their towns; but the later inscription of the same type (*Syll.*³, No. 232), dated to the spring of 338 B.C., lists four *archons*, a secretary, and five witnesses from various towns, which probably indicates an organization acting for Phocis as a whole—at the very least, that the individual towns were reorganized (Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 535-37).

³⁴ Mnason of Elateia is known as a pro-Macedonian, although his activity may have fallen in the period of Alexander rather than in that of Philip (Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 39; H. Berve, *Das Alexanderreich auf prosopographischer Grundlage* [Munich, 1926], II, No. 539).

³⁵ See the fragment from Philochorus: *ἡμεῖς οὖν Νίκαιαν Λοκροῖς παραδίδωμεν κατὰ τὸ δόγμα τὸ τῶν Ἀμφικτυόνων* (M. P. Foucart, "Étude sur Didymos d'après un papyrus de Berlin," *Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres*, XXXVIII, Part I [1909], 204-9). The decree of the Amphictyons which is referred to would be the decision of 346 B.C., depriving Locris of Nicaea (for discussion see Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 531-32; Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 160).

³⁷ The lists of delegates to the board of *naopoioi* in Delphi have been studied by Cloché (*op. cit.*, pp. 78-142; "Les Naopes de Delphes et la création du collège des tamiai," *BCH*, XLIV [1920], 312-27), who points out their connection with political events but warns against a rigid parallelism. The lists of the meeting in the autumn of 339 B.C., at which only 19 delegates were present (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 117 ff.; *BCH*, XLIV [1920], 312-27; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 169, No. 47, ll. 66-78), and of the meeting of autumn, 338 B.C., to which 31 delegates came (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 123-24; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 175, No. 48, ll. 8-22), are particularly interesting for our purposes.

through the Macedonian representation on the Amphictyonic Council as by using the Thessalians, with their traditional prestige, as his agents both in the Council and on the board of *naopoioi*. This method had worked successfully and, perhaps, had done something to smooth over irritation in an organization in which the feeling for tradition was very strong.³⁸ The Thessalian *hieromnemes*, however, who had served Philip's interests since 346 B.C., were identified with the Council's severe penalties against Phocis and had been very active in supporting a Thessalian hegemony in Council affairs. As Philip's policy with respect to both Phocis and Locris ran counter to the policy of 346 B.C., he apparently found it wiser to make a change which would facilitate his plans. Thus two new Thessalian *hieromnemes*, Daochos and Thrasydaïos, appeared in the spring of 338 B.C. As well as making them the authors of the change in political policy, Philip took certain steps through them to increase the efficiency and prestige of the oracle and to give it a more international aspect. The reduction of the Phocian indemnity would mean a considerable loss to the treasury. Thus, to insure a better financial administration, a new treasury board, the *tamiai*, was established in the autumn of 339 B.C. to supervise the work of the *naopoioi* and to serve as a link between them and the Council. This measure at first caused some dissatisfaction among the *naopoioi*, particularly

among the members from those states which already had a political grievance against Philip. The irritation, however, was only temporary, and the *naopoioi* were playing their due part again in 338 B.C. and in the succeeding years.³⁹ In the spring of 338 B.C. a new Amphictyonic coinage appeared, designed to establish a uniform currency in the Amphictyonic district.⁴⁰ Philip himself probably presided at the Pythian Games held shortly after the battle of Chaeronea; and in the following years the activity of *tamiai* and *naopoioi* secured new buildings and furnishings to replace the depredations made by the Phocians.⁴¹

The restoration of Phocis and the increase of the influence of the Amphictyonic Council would, in itself, contribute much to the weakening of the power of Thebes and the Boeotian League in central Greece. Philip, however, took further steps to depose Thebes from its leadership in the League, to weaken the city's power, and to bind the loyalty of both Thebes and the League to himself. The procedure of the settlement is not entirely clear, but it seems probable that a distinction was made between Thebes and the other towns of the League. Possibly a settlement was made first with Thebes, as the circumstances after the battle would dictate, and then, when a government favorable to Philip had been installed, a general settle-

³⁸ It is interesting to note that Delphi itself had no representative at the meeting of the *naopoioi* in 339 B.C., which Cloché attributed to pique at the creation of the board of *tamiai*, for, in its case, there would be no political motive (*BCH*, XLIV [1920], 322-23). Before the board of *tamiai* had been created, a commission of the Delphian *prytaneis* had administered the funds. On the significance of the changes at Delphi see Glotz, *op. cit.*, pp. 541-46; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 14; for Daochos and Thrasydaïos, *ibid.*, p. 170.

⁴⁰ Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 1302; Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 161, n. 3.

⁴¹ Diod. xvi. 60; Dem. v. 22, ix. 32; Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 1296. For the restoration of the objects pillaged by the Phocians see Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 177, commentary on ll. 23-24.

³⁹ Membership on the Council was very firmly fixed by tradition. Megalopolis and Messene, apparently hoping for Philip's support, had tried, ca. 344 B.C., to secure Council seats but seem to have failed. Even Sparta's withdrawal in 346 B.C. seems to have been misrepresented by Pausanias (Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 18, n. 5; G. Daux, *Delphes au IV^e et au I^{er} siècle* [Paris, 1936], pp. 329-30). The lists of *naopoioi* mentioned in n. 37 show a steady attendance of the Thessalian delegation, which was larger than that from any other state (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 80 ff.; XLIV [1920], 314-15). A Thessalian, Cottiphos, had also held the presidency of the Amphictyonic Council from 346 to 339 B.C.

ment with the League.⁴² In the case of Thebes, Philip is said to have taken ransom for the prisoners and the dead and to have allowed the political exiles to return. From them he appointed a council of three hundred, which would insure a government favorable to himself. Once appointed, this council proceeded to conduct a purge of anti-Macedonians, which resulted in executions, banishments, and confiscations.⁴³ Further to safeguard Macedonian interests in the region, a garrison was placed in the city.⁴⁴

The League itself evidently remained in existence, and Thebes retained its membership,⁴⁵ but the dominating influence of the city was broken by the restoration of Orchomenus, Plataea, and Thespieae,⁴⁶ all formerly destroyed by Thebes. The Theban representation was changed on the

board of *naopoioi* in Delphi; for, in the meeting of 338 B.C., held after Chaeronea, Thespieae and Tanagra sent delegates.⁴⁷ Boeotian territory remained intact, except for the loss of Oropus to Athens⁴⁸ and the reversion of Nicaea to the Locrians. Thus in central Greece a new balance of power among small, weak states was established; Philip's diplomatic hold on the region was further increased through the Amphictyonic Council, and his military control strengthened by the garrison placed in Thebes, the nodal point of the district.

ATHENS AND EUBOEA

A speedy settlement with Athens was of the highest importance to Philip, for the anti-Macedonian sentiment there was stronger than in the other states and the defeat of the city's land forces was only half the battle. Its fleet was still the strongest on the Aegean, and, with the well-fortified base of Piraeus, Athens, if besieged, could have afforded Philip considerable trouble had resistance been prolonged. Then, too, the trade carried on by

⁴² Aelian (*op. cit.* vi. 1) states that Thebes surrendered to Philip, and Justin (*ix.* 4. 6-10) lists terms such as would be given to the city itself. The evidence indicating that the League was allowed to survive and that other towns were restored hints that a settlement was made with the League as representative of Boeotian interests as a whole. In any case some settlement in treaty form was made (Diod. xvi. 87. 3).

⁴³ Justin *ix.* 4. 6-10. Schaefer (*op. cit.*, III², p. 20, n. 1) has followed the view that a distinction should be made between the actions of Philip and those of the restored government. Justin plainly states that Philip had some Thebans put to death and others banished and that he made confiscations, but he goes on to describe the trials conducted by the restored government; thus he appears to be rather loosely attributing the results to Philip. Philip did, however, arrange that Demades should receive lands in Boeotia (Suidas s.v. "Demades"). The purge is presumably exaggerated, since enough anti-Macedonians were found to rise in strength against Alexander in 335 B.C.

⁴⁴ Diod. xvi. 87. 3; Paus. *ix.* 1. 8. 6. 5. Wüst (*op. cit.*, p. 169) connects this measure with the organization of the Corinthian League. There is no evidence to support the view, and it seems likely that Philip would avoid making such an overt gesture of military control in connection with the League, when it could have been arranged in the immediate aftermath of Chaeronea so that it would seem a natural military precaution. According to a principle of the League treaties, no city was to receive a foreign garrison (Ps.-Dem. xvii. 8). Thus, although the garrisoning of Ambracia, Thebes, Corinth, and Chalkis was against the spirit of the League arrangements, it was probably a *fait accompli* by the time of the constituent assembly, so that the Greeks would scarcely raise the point there (for bibliography see Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 371, n. 125).

⁴⁵ Arrian *op. cit.* i. 7. 11; the passage mentions Theban *Boeotarchs*. Evidently, the anti-Macedonian faction remained sufficiently strong and Thebes sufficiently powerful in the League to assure itself of considerable voice in affairs. Hyperides (*i.* 18) indicates that the League was in existence in 324 B.C. For discussion of the significance of the passage in Hyperides see A. Aymard, "Un Ordre d'Alexandre," *REA*, XXXIX (1937), 5-28; on the Boeotian League in the fourth century see Busolt-Swoboda, *op. cit.*, p. 1431, n. 4; Beloch, *op. cit.*, IV, 2, 426.

⁴⁶ For Plataea and Orchomenus see Paus. *ix.* 1. 8. 37. 8, iv. 27. 10; Diod. xvii. 13. 5. Alexander, too, had a share in their restoration (Arrian *op. cit.* i. 9. 10; Plutarch *Alexander* 34; *Aristides* 11). Schaefer adds Thespieae, since the Thespians dedicated a statue to Philip (Dio Chrys. xxxvii. 42 [466]).

⁴⁷ Cloché, *BCH*, XL (1916), 125. A Theban delegate had attended in 339 B.C. (Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 169, No. 47, l. 72), but none was present in 338 B.C. (*ibid.*, pp. 175-76, No. 48, ll. 8-22).

⁴⁸ Paus. i. 34. 1; Schol. to Dem. xviii. 99; Demades *Ἐν τῇ δόξῃ*. 10; Diod. xviii. 56. 7. Hyperides (*Euzenippus*) describes the territory of Oropus being divided among the Athenian tribes. The fragment referring to Oropus, which is ascribed to Aristotle's *dikaionomata* (*Opera Aristotelis*, ed. Acad. Boruss., Vol. V [Berlin, 1870], Frag. 570) is associated with this revision made by Philip (Nissen, *op. cit.*, p. 169).

the city was of importance not only to itself but to the whole of Greece, so that, to avoid economic disturbance also, Philip would have wished to come to terms. Thus he was influenced by very potent practical considerations, as well as disposed by his Philhellenic sentiment to offer more generous conditions than those given to Thebes.⁴⁹ The conduct of the negotiations, in which the orator, Demades, played such a large part, is well known and needs no repetition, save to note that Philip himself took the initiative, first, in sending Demades to Athens and then in setting his terms before the delegation of Demades, Aeschines, and Phocion, although they had apparently been empowered to discuss only the release of prisoners.⁵⁰ Philip's considerate behavior in returning the prisoners without ransom and in sending back the bones of the dead helped to influence the Athenians to accept the terms which Demades proposed to the assembly.⁵¹

The terms of the treaty have to be pieced together from various sources; but it is clear that, as in the case of Thebes, they were designed to destroy the real power of the state, although allowing it more outward signs of independence. The strength of Athens had, of course, lain in its naval supremacy and control of key points in the Aegean and in the Thracian Chersonese. Accordingly, the confederacy was dissolved,⁵² but the city itself retained full independence⁵³ and the control of certain islands settled by Athenian cleruchs—Lemnos, Samos, Skyros, Imbros, and

Delos.⁵⁴ In addition, it received Oropus from Boeotia. Since full independence was retained, no Macedonian forces entered Athenian territory,⁵⁵ and Athens was able, as we have noticed, to offer hospitality and citizenship to refugees from its former allies. In addition, there was no purge of anti-Macedonians—Demosthenes, in fact, pronounced the funeral oration over the Athenian dead.⁵⁶ The treaty also stipulated that the Athenians be allowed to enter Philip's proposed league.⁵⁷ That is possibly to be construed as a pointed invitation rather than an open choice. In most discussions of the treaty it is stated that the freedom of the seas was guaranteed for each party, but that seems very doubtful.⁵⁸ It is likely, however, that

⁴⁹ Lemnos (Arist. *Ath. pol.* 61. 6, 62. 2), Samos (*ibid.* 62. 2; Plut. *Alex.* 28; Diog. Laert. x. 1. 1; Athenaeus iii. 99d; Diod. xviii. 56. 6), Skyros (Arist. *Ath. pol.* 62. 2), Imbros (*ibid.*), Delos (*JG*, II², 1652).

⁵⁰ Aristides xiii (182), xix (258).

⁵¹ Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 365–68; Wüst, *op. cit.*, pp. 170–71. Momigliano (*Filippo*, p. 162) has interpreted the continuance of anti-Macedonian activity in Athens and the military reorganization as indicative of a merely provisional adherence to the Macedonian hegemony.

⁵² Plut. *Phocion* 16. The account is a condensed and somewhat ambiguous version of Athens' treaty-making with Philip. Phocion advised accepting the separate peace offered by Philip but objected to Athens' sharing in the *koine eirene* and the *syndrion* of the League before Philip's military demands from the Greeks became known. The passage allows two interpretations: first, that there were (a) a separate peace, (b) a distinct and later proposal to enter the League, (c) military demands, made known after the League was formed; second, that the proposal to enter the League was only a clause in the separate treaty with Philip; in any case, no military demands were connected with the separate treaty. The second interpretation seems preferable, as the phrase *τὴν ἄλλην πολιτείαν* seems to link (a) and (b). Schaefer has interpreted it thus (*op. cit.*, III², 29, n. 3). If this is correct, it seems a plausible suggestion that such a stipulation was a part of all the separate treaties, although there is no evidence for the others. *Syll.*³, No. 260 refers, of course, to the treaty made upon Athens' entry into the League of Corinth (see n. 13).

⁵³ This term is usually read into the treaty (Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 29, n. 1; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 364), and a reference made to Ps.-Dem. xvii. 19. That passage, however, refers to the regulation of the League of Corinth. There appears to be no reason to ascribe such a term to the separate treaty except that the Rhodians, on receipt of the false news of Athens'

⁴⁰ Kaerst, *op. cit.*, I, 264–65; Wüst, *op. cit.*, pp. 169–70.

⁴¹ See the excellent account of Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 20–29.

⁴² Pol. v. 10. 1–5; Justin ix. 4. 4; Diod. xvi. 87, xxxii. 4; Plut. *Phocion* 16; Demades *ῥῆσις* *ἑξ* 10; Demosth. *Ep.* iii. 11–12.

⁴³ Paus. i. 25. 3; Diod. xxxii. 4; Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, i. 572, n. 3 (for the Chersonese).

⁴⁴ Paus. vii. 10. 5.

Macedonian vessels were prohibited the use of the Peiraeus, just as their land forces remained off Athenian territory.⁵⁹ This separate treaty, too, is usually interpreted as establishing an alliance between Athens and Philip; but none of its terms seems to indicate any intention of joint action, and it is probable that Philip would not have forced the situation, since the League of Corinth was, in any case, to arrange mutual alliances.⁶⁰ Thus Athens, on the whole, received very generous treatment and indicated her co-operation with Philip both by entering the League on its formation and by returning to participation in affairs at Delphi in the autumn of 338 B.C.⁶¹

Closely related to the settlement of Athens was that of Euboea. Since the

destruction, had seized some Athenian cargo (Lycurg. *Leoc.* 14–15, 18; Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 29, n. 1). Its release would be a matter of negotiation between the two states, and the occasion would scarcely arise again, since the Athenian fleet was left intact. Such a term, to be effective, would have had to be binding on all states, as provided for in the League regulation.

⁵⁹ So Schaefer (*op. cit.*, III², 27, n. 6) with reference to Ps.-Dem. xvii. 26, 28. The reference is to a League regulation (see sec. 28 at the end); but such a provision would be an obvious complement to the barring of troops from Athenian territory and would also concern only the two parties to the agreement.

⁶⁰ Diodorus (xvi. 87. 3) calls the settlement *φιλίαν τε καὶ συμμαχίαν*; but his language, as frequently, need not be taken as technically accurate. Polybius (v. 10. 5) states that Philip made the Athenians *συναγωνιστάς*, instead of enemies—only a general expression or possibly to be referred to the later treaty of the League. Glotz-Cohen (*op. cit.*, III, 364) construed the treaty as an alliance, apparently on the grounds of the term guaranteeing freedom of the seas; but, as argued above, its authenticity is doubtful. Hampl's view that all the treaties were alliances was based on the conception that the League was a *koine eirene* only, which seems incorrect (see above, nn. 5 and 6). Wüst (*op. cit.*, p. 168) considered that an alliance was made, but Schwahn (*Heeresmatrikel und Landfriede*, p. 36, n. 3) that there was no alliance.

⁶¹ No Athenian delegates had attended the meeting of the *naupoloi* in autumn (339 B.C.), but they and nine contractors were present again for the meeting of 338 B.C., about two months after Chaeronea (Cloché, *BCH*, XL (1916), 120–21, 125; XLIV [1920], 317–18; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, pp. 175–76, No. 48, II. 13–14; p. 177, n. 1).

island was a key point for communication by sea between northern and central Greece, its control had been a bone of contention in the struggle between Athens and Philip. Athens, in 341 B.C., had succeeded with the aid of certain Chalcidians—Callias and Taurosthenes, in particular—in winning over Chalcis and making it the nucleus for the formation of a Euboean League.⁶² After the battle, the Euboeans, presumably the League organization, surrendered to Philip,⁶³ so that the pro-Athenian leaders were forced into exile to Athens, where they were made citizens.⁶⁴ There is no evidence for the terms of the settlement, but it is likely that the League organization remained intact, with Philip's own partisans in charge.⁶⁵ Chalcis, of course, with its advantageous situation on the Euripus, was later known as one of the fetters of Greece, and it is probable that, like Ambracia, Thebes, and Corinth, it was garrisoned by Philip, although its full development lay rather in the period of Alexander.⁶⁶ The reversals of government would result in the usual crop of banishments and confiscations, but there is no evidence for any particularly punitive measures. As Athens had done, Euboea returned to its participation in Delphic affairs in the autumn of 338 B.C.⁶⁷

⁶² *IG*, XII, 9, p. 153; Aesch. iii. 89, 91–92, 94 ff.; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 329–31.

⁶³ Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1; see above, n. 1; Schol. to Aristides *Panath.* 178. 12.

⁶⁴ Hyperides i. 20; Aesch. iii. 85–87.

⁶⁵ The League was in existence, possibly as a result of a refounding, in 298–294 B.C., when Demetrius held Euboea (*IG*, XII, 9, No. 207; the regulations of this document seem to presuppose a league organization). The view that the League was dissolved by Philip (Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 38; Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 174) is not supported by any evidence and seems very unlikely, since Philip's general policy was to support federal organizations.

⁶⁶ Strabo x. 1. 8 (447); Pol. xxxviii. 3. 3; Arrian *op. cit.* ii. 2. 4.

⁶⁷ Cloché, *BCH*, XL (1916), 117, 123–24; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 175, No. 48, I. 12.

D. MEGARA AND THE STATES OF THE NORTHERN PELOPONNESUS

Megara, Corinth, the Achaean League, and the towns on Akte had been members of the Athenian coalition. None, however, had been a particularly formidable adversary against which Philip needed to take severe action. Yet Corinth had considerable strategic value as the gate-keeper of the Peloponnesus.⁶⁸ Thus in the settlements it is singled out to house a Macedonian garrison, as Ambracia and Thebes had been. Although the terms of the settlements are almost completely lost, Hyperides' speech against Athenogenes throws a flash of light on the events in Troezen immediately after the battle of Chaeronea. They are probably typical of the sudden reversals of government which occurred in many of the anti-Macedonian states. Athens, in the flush of excitement following the battle, called on its near-by allies for aid, among which were Troezen and Epidaurus.⁶⁹ Although the Troezenians passed a decree voting aid, they would scarcely have had time to send their troops across the gulf. In the meantime, a Macedonian partisan, Athenogenes by name, who had come from Athens in the course of the war (with malice aforethought?), called upon Mnasia of Argos for aid and brought about a change of government. Like the other refugees, the exiled Troezenians fled to Athens and were made citizens.⁷⁰ Philip must have made his settlement with the new pro-Macedonian government,⁷¹ which was apparently sufficient guaranty of the

city's loyalty to keep it independent of Argos, for it continued to send its own delegates to the meetings of the *naopoioi* in Delphi.⁷²

In Megara there was probably a change of government similar to that in Troezen, followed by the surrender of the state to Philip.⁷³ None of the terms of settlement are known; but Megara, which had not sent delegates to the meeting of the *naopoioi* in 339 B.C., did so again in the autumn of 338 B.C.⁷⁴

Corinth, like Athens, at first made ready for a siege⁷⁵ but on Philip's approach, or possibly after an internal revolution, gave up the idea of resistance and surrendered.⁷⁶ Philip garrisoned Acrocorinth⁷⁷ and, when the time was ready, called the first meeting of the delegates to the new league in Corinth. No other penalties are known to have been imposed, although, if Coreyra and Ambracia were regarded as Corinthian colonies, they would presumably be freed from any jurisdiction which the city had exercised over them.⁷⁸

The Achaean League surrendered⁷⁹ and seems to have been generously treated. Its extra-territorial possession, Naupac-

⁶⁸ Troezen sent a delegate in autumn, 339 B.C. (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 117; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 169, No. 47, l. 76), but not to the meeting held in the autumn of 338 B.C. Probably, then, the revolution in Troezen is to be dated in September–October, 338 B.C. A Troezenian delegate was present again in 335 B.C. (*BCH*, XL [1916], 128).

⁶⁹ Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1.

⁷⁰ Cloché, *BCH*, XL (1916), 117, 123–24; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 176, No. 48, l. 21.

⁷¹ Lucian *On the Writing of History* 3.

⁷² Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1. Corinth, with strong economic interests at Delphi, sent its delegates to the meetings of the *naopoioi* in both 339 and 338 B.C. (Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 169, No. 47, ll. 74–75; p. 175, No. 48, ll. 17–18).

⁷³ Plut. *Aratus* 23; Pol. xxxviii. 3. 3.

⁷⁴ Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 94, n. 1. Demosthenes' reference (ix. 34) to Ambracia as "Corinthian" is probably to be interpreted as indicating its traditional affiliation only.

⁷⁵ Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1; above, n. 1.

⁶⁸ Plut. *Apophthegmata Laconica* 221 F; when a Spartan saw the camp of Philip near Corinth, he reproached the Corinthians for being bad gate-keepers of the Peloponnesus.

⁶⁹ Lycurg. *Leoc.* 42.

⁷⁰ Hyperides *Athenogenes* 29–35.

⁷¹ Aelian *op. cit.* vi. 1. Philip made his settlements in the Peloponnesus after his arrival there (Arrian *op. cit.* vii. 9. 5), probably in November, 338 B.C. (above, n. 19).

tus, was lost to Aetolia,⁸⁰ but the League itself was not dissolved.⁸¹ Further, its government seems to have been more stable than those of many other of the Greek states, as there is an indication that no revolutions took place.⁸²

Elis, although it had sent no aid to Philip at Chaeronea, had been allied to him since 343 B.C. as the result of an oligarchical revolution in the state.⁸³ The policy of the oligarchs had been maintained with difficulty against democratic opposition,⁸⁴ so that, when Philip entered the Peloponnesus, the Eleans, apparently to allay suspicions as well as to satisfy a desire for revenge, joined him in the invasion of Laconia.⁸⁵ There is no indication that Elis received any direct reward for this aid, but the sanctuary at Olympia was later enhanced by the erection of the Philippeion,⁸⁶ and the Eleans themselves set up an equestrian statue to Philip.⁸⁷

⁸⁰ This would probably be one of the terms of settlement which would thus legally confirm its reversion to Aetolia (see above, p. 77).

⁸¹ Polybius (II. 40. 5, 41. 9) remarks that the League was dissolved by the early Macedonian leaders, but it was in existence in 324 B.C. (Hyperides I. 18).

⁸² In Pellene a tyrant, Chalcron, came into power with the support, or the acquiescence, of Alexander (Ps.-Dem. xvii. 10; Athen. xi. 509b; Paus. vii. 27. 7). It was charged by the writer of Ps.-Dem. xvii that this was a breach of the regulation of the Corinthian League which guaranteed the governments existing at the time of its foundation. It is probable, then, that there was no disturbance before Pellene's entrance into the Corinthian League, or that would have provided additional material to the pamphleteer. Also, Pellene was the only Achaean state not to co-operate with Agis in 331 B.C., which may be explained by the presence of this tyrant and the continuance of anti-Macedonian governments in the other cities of the Achaean League (Aesch. iii. 165; Ernst Meyer, P.-W., XIX, 362-63).

⁸³ Paus. v. 4. 9; above, n. 18; for discussion and further evidence see Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 541.

⁸⁴ Plut. *De ira coh.* 457 f.; *Apophth. reg.* 179a; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 332.

⁸⁵ Paus. v. 4. 9. According to Aelian (*op. cit.* vi. 1) the Eleans surrendered to Philip after Chaeronea. This is a mistake, possibly originating in a reminiscence of the hostility noticed in the preceding note.

⁸⁶ Paus. v. 20. 10.

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* vi. 11. 1.

SPARTA, ARGOS, ARCADIA, AND MESSENE

It remains to discuss the adjustment made by Philip in the relations between Sparta and his allies, Argos, Arcadia, and Messene. This problem was of a different nature from that of the other settlements. Naupactus could have been given to Aetolia, Nicaea restored to Locris, and Oropus given to Athens without difficulty, since they had all been in enemy possession and Philip, as victor, had them at his disposal. Sparta, however, was not a member of the Athenian coalition and had not taken any action hostile to Macedonia. Yet the relations of Sparta and its neighbors constituted the "Peloponnesian problem" of the fourth century, so that some settlement was necessary in the interests of a quiet Greece.

The ownership of the border districts of Thyrea and Cynuria had been a point of contention between Argos and Sparta for generations, with both sides developing, in the course of time, a claim by appeal to the traditional division of the Peloponnesus by the Heraclidae.⁸⁸ Sparta, however, had usually been able to make good its claim by force of arms. Sparta had also had a long dispute with Megalopolis over the Belbinatis and with Tegea over the Skiritis and Karyae.⁸⁹ After the establishment of Messene as an independent power in 369 B.C., its Laconian frontier became a subject of dispute, for Sparta retained territory to the west of Taygetus—the Ager Denthaliatis, the coastal territory in southeastern Messenia, and some of the perioecic towns farther to the west along the coast of the gulf.⁹⁰ This dispute would merge into the same general issue as a result of Epaminondas' policy in supporting Argos, Arcadia, and Messene

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* ii. 20. 1, 38. 5, vii. 11. 1-2; Isoc. *Panath.* 91.

⁸⁹ Paus. viii. 35. 4; Livy xxxviii. 34. 8; Pol. ix. 28. 7; Theopompus, *Frag.* 238 (Jacoby, *op. cit.*); Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 575, n. 1.

⁹⁰ Roebuck, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-39, 56-57.

as a bloc against Sparta. Thus Messene, too, developed a claim based on its version of the traditional division of the Peloponnesus by the Heraclidae.⁹¹ This contention would, of course, fit neatly into Philip's propaganda and plans, for he claimed to be a Heraclid and had adopted Epaminondas' solution of the Peloponnesian problem. Not only was the issue one of traditional prestige and even of economic advantage in the possession of additional territory, but the passes by which Sparta had access to the fertile plains of its neighbors and thence to the outside world lay through these border areas. Sparta had never recognized the establishment of Messene⁹² and had shown little disposition to acquiesce in its own diminished power, for southern Arcadia had been invaded in 352 B.C.⁹³ and further aggressive action had been planned in 344 B.C.⁹⁴ The armed intervention of Thebes

had saved Megalopolis in 352, and the strong diplomatic *démarche* of Philip in 344; but, before Chaeronea, no change had been made in the control of the border territory. Although Philip had no grievance to find in Spartan action after 344 B.C.,⁹⁵ what guaranty was there that they would remain quiescent? It remained to complete the work already begun.

After Philip had received the surrender of Megara, Corinth, the towns on Akte, and Achaëa, he proceeded to Argos, the traditional homeland of his ancestor Heracles. The Argive political leader, Mnasia, had already shown his zeal by assisting the pro-Macedonian party in Troezen, and Philip was warmly welcomed in Argos.⁹⁶ Thence he proceeded to Arcadia, where he may have taken steps to mend the rift in the Arcadian League,⁹⁷ as well as to sponsor the terri-

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, p. 44; see Isoc. *Archidamus* 17 ff. for the Spartan claims. Treves (*op. cit.*, pp. 103-4) has cogently argued that a national Messenian tradition must have been developed in the century preceding the re-founding of the city and received renewed impetus, reflected by Alcidas' *Messeniakos logos* and Isocrates' *Archidamus*, upon the refounding. Certainly, there are traces of it in the sources before 369 B.C. For example, to the passages noticed by Treves might be added some of the fragments of Hellanicus, which show a tendency to connect Attic and Messenian history (L. Pearson, *Early Ionian Historians* [Oxford, 1939], p. 213) and the evidence of a treaty (?) between Athens and the Messenians in the middle of the fifth century B.C. (*JG*, I, 37; Merritt, *Hesperia*, XIII [1944], 224-29). How much of this tradition was truly Messenian, however, and how much Athenian fabrication, inspired by political opportunism to take advantage of the sporadic outbreaks of a serf population, would be a very difficult problem to resolve. In any case it seems probable that only when there was some actual hope of establishing Messenian ownership to land within their natural boundary, Taygetus, with the help of Thebes or Macedonia, would the Messenians make full use of the opportunity to utilize and embellish their national traditions. This legendary material would provide the sources on which Aristotle based his *dikaiomata* (see appendix); for, as Nissen pointed out (*op. cit.*, pp. 168-70), mythological tradition had as much validity as legal decisions to the Greek mind of that period.

⁹² Roebuck, *op. cit.*, pp. 44-47.

⁹³ Diod. xvi. 39; Glotz-Cohen, *op. cit.*, III, 256-57.

⁹⁴ Roebuck, *op. cit.*, pp. 49-50.

⁹⁵ The Spartans had remained aloof from the diplomatic entanglements and intrigues of the years immediately preceding the war. They had, however, continued to take a part in Delphic affairs, except for the meeting of the *naopoioi* in autumn, 339 B.C. Cloché has explained this abstention as caused by resentment at the creation of the board of *tamiai* (*BCH*, XL [1916], 122-23; XLIV [1920], 318-19). The Spartans also sent four delegates to the meeting held in the autumn of 338 B.C., some two months after Chaeronea, which, then, took place before the invasion of Sparta by Philip and, presumably, before his intentions were known (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 127-28; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 176, No. 48, ll. 20-22).

⁹⁶ Plut. *Erot.* 760a-b. Argos sent delegates to the meetings of the *naopoioi* in both 339 and 338 B.C. (Cloché, *BCH*, XL [1916], 121-25; Bourguet, *op. cit.*, p. 169, No. 47, ll. 72-74; pp. 175-76, No. 48, ll. 17, 19).

⁹⁷ On the reconstitution of the League see Beloch, *op. cit.*, III, 1, 574; 2, 173-77. Beloch's attribution to Philip of the reorganization of the Arcadian League rests mainly on the dating of the inscription (Ditt. *Syll.*³, No. 183) to the period after Chaeronea. It is an honorary decree for an Athenian, Phylarchus, voted by the Council and the *myrioi* of the Arcadians. The decree contains a list of 50 *damiourgoi* from 10 member-states, including Megalopolis, Mantinea, the Maenalians, and the Cynourians. The two last-mentioned became members of the city-organization of Megalopolis in 369 and 361 B.C. (Paus. viii. 27. 3-4; Hiller von Gaertringen, *Ath. Mitt.*, XXXVI [1911], 355-58). The decree omits, however, most of the towns of northern Arcadia, including Stympalus, one of whose citizens served as general for the Arcadian League in 366 B.C. (Xen. *Hell.* vii. 3. 1). Thus the decree would seem to

torial claims of Megalopolis and Tegea. From Arcadia he invaded Laconia in the late autumn of 338 B.C. and laid it waste.⁹⁸

There is a certain amount of fragmentary information in the sources concerning the invasion and the subsequent territorial adjustments; but it represents two conflicting traditions, derived from the claims of the two parties to the dispute. Thus it has led to different interpretations in the modern treatments. There are three main literary sources: passages in Polybius, particularly the debate of Chlaeneas, the Aetolian, and Lyciscus, the Acarnanian, before the Spartan assembly in 210 B.C.;⁹⁹ a poem of Isyllos, the Epidaurian

represent the condition of the League at a period before the Maenallians and Cynourians were completely absorbed by Megalopolis, before Stymphalus joined the League, and when Mantinea and Megalopolis were not at odds—that is, before 366 B.C. The period is difficult to fix, however, because of the internal dissensions which rent the League in its formative stage and which, presumably, are not all mentioned in the sources. Beloch's view that such a period is best found at the time of the settlements after Chaeronea involves rejecting Pausanias' evidence as mistaken and placing the final absorption of the Maenallians and Cynourians into Megalopolis at some unknown date after 338 B.C. Cary, on the other hand, has argued that the document belongs to the year 369, 368, or 367 B.C., before northern Arcadia was drawn into the League (*JHS*, XLII [1922], 188–90). Yet, if Stymphalus provided a general in 366 B.C., it seems likely that the city was a League member of tried loyalty and several years' standing, so that the period 369–367 B.C. seems very brief in which to fit the decree. Cary's view is probably to be preferred as doing no violence to the existing evidence, although that of Beloch has usually been followed and rests on historically sound considerations (Hiller von Gaertringen, *Klio*, XXI [1927], 10, who has withdrawn his former dating of the decree in 361 B.C.; Monigglano, *Filippo*, p. 162; Wüst, *op. cit.*, p. 173; none of these scholars refers to the argument of Cary). Whatever Philip's action with respect to the League may have been, he was regarded by the Megalopolitans as a great benefactor of their state (Pol. xviii. 14; a stoa bordering on the agora was erected in Philip's honor, Paus. viii. 30. 6, 31. 9). It is possible, of course, that such an honor was only in gratitude for the territorial adjustments made in favor of Megalopolis.

⁹⁸ See below, n. 107.

⁹⁹ Pol. xviii. 14; ix. 28–31, 32–39. "The speeches of Chlaeneas and Lyciscus of Acarnania are to be regarded as essentially based on a genuine record" (F. W. Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* [Oxford, 1940], p. 87, n. 1).

poet,¹⁰⁰ who wrote paeans celebrating the "miracles" of Asclepius in the early third century B.C.; some of the *Apophthegmata Laconica* of Plutarch.¹⁰¹ It has been stated that Polybius' evidence is valuable for the "conflicting political ideologies prevailing in the age of Philip V . . . but almost valueless as evidence for our reconstruction of the history of the age of Demosthenes." That is true of the manner and spirit in which the passages are written and of the judgments expressed on Philip in them; but is the factual material, some of it attested from other sources, false and to be ignored?¹⁰² Isyllos' poem and the *Apophthegmata* might seem in themselves to be worthy of little credence; but Isyllos lived only two generations after Philip's invasion of Laconia, and, since his poem was set up in the sanctuary of Epidaurus, it should represent a popular tradition of so recent an event. The *Apophthegmata*, for their part, apparently depict successive steps in the negotiations between Philip and the Spartans.

It seems clear from Polybius that Argos, Arcadia, and Messene invited Philip to support their claims to the disputed territories at the opportune moment after the battle of Chaeronea, probably when he had arrived at the Isthmus or at Argos.¹⁰³ As pointed out above, Philip would

¹⁰⁰ *IG*, IV, 950; Wilamowitz, "Isyllos von Epidaurus," *Philologische Untersuchungen*, Vol. IX (1886), poem E. It is usually accepted that the Philip mentioned is Philip II, not Philip V, and that Isyllos' *floruit* is to be placed ca. 280 B.C. (R. Herzog, *Die Wunderheilungen von Epidaurus*, *Philologus*, Supplementband XXII, Heft 3 [1931], 41 ff.).

¹⁰¹ They are collected by Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III, 44–46. References to the *Apophthegmata* are to the edition of the *Moralia* by W. Nachstädt, W. Sieveking, and J. Titchener (Leipzig, 1935).

¹⁰² See appendix.

¹⁰³ Roebuck, *op. cit.*, p. 54, n. 19; as indicated above (n. 95), the Spartans attended the meeting of the *naopoioi* in 338 B.C., which would have taken place in October. Philip, then, would have had no dealings with them up to this point, and he apparently made no attempt to deal with Peloponnesian affairs until his arrival there (Arrian *op. cit.* vii. 9. 5). Thus the negotiations with Sparta would not have started until he was at Corinth or on his way to Arcadia.

desire a settlement in their favor to complete the policy embarked upon in 344 B.C. Accordingly, he would make his wishes known to the Spartans, hoping that he could intimidate them into acquiescence. Some of the *Apophthegmata* mention an exchange of letters between Philip and the Spartans, in which he made certain requests which were refused.¹⁰⁴ The nature of the requests is not specified, but it is reasonable to suppose that they

were the territorial adjustments, since another apophthegm quotes an observation to the effect that Philip would make Greece inaccessible to the Lacedaemonians.¹⁰⁵ If the nature of the replies has been correctly stated by Plutarch, they were scarcely likely to appease Philip. Others of the *Apophthegmata* indicate that the requests of Philip were debated and refused, a vote taken for war by the Spartan assembly, and discussions held on the proper military policy, the decision being in favor of fighting in Laconia.¹⁰⁶ Thus, if the *Apophthegmata* may be taken as really indicating the course of events, they show that Philip made an attempt to come to a settlement with the Spartans by negotiation, which was refused. There was, then, nothing wilful in the invasion save in the nature of the demands themselves, which, it seems, were the demands for cession of the border areas. Philip, as we know, did invade Laconia and lay it waste;¹⁰⁷ but he does not seem to have made a serious effort to destroy the state and its institutions. It was sufficient for the moment to weaken the Spartans and give his allies an opportunity to occupy the disputed territory.¹⁰⁸

Isyllos, however, presents us with another tradition. Philip is said to have invaded Laconia with the purpose of destroying the royal house and the Lyncurgan institutions. He failed in this, so that the Spartans, who had invoked the aid of

¹⁰⁴ Archidamus, No. 1 (*Apophth. Lac.* 218 E): Philip wrote a rather stern letter to Archidamus, to which the latter replied impertinently (since Archidamus is reported to have died in Italy on the day on which the battle of Chaeronea was fought, the attribution to him of certain of the *Apophthegmata* is incorrect [see Schaefer, *op. cit.*, III², 44, n. 5]). *Incert.*, No. 28 (*Apophth. Lac.* 233 E): Philip wrote, upon arriving in Laconia, "Whether they wish him to come as friend or foe"; they replied, "Neither." This is couched in the normal language of a request for passage through the territory of another state (cf. Agesilaus, Nos. 42-43 [*Apophth. Lac.* 211 C-D]). *Incert.*, No. 53 (*Apophth. Lac.* 235 A): Philip made a request by letter, to which they replied, "No." Agis, No. 16 (*Apophth. Lac.* 216 A-B): Agis went alone as an envoy to Philip. The anecdote retailed by Stobaeus would fit here (*Flor.* vii. 59): Philip came to Laconia, encamped, and threatened stern measures unless the Spartans carried out his orders; one of the Spartans, hearing the threats, said that he was very glad that nothing prevented warriors from dying (this same story is told by Cicerio *Tusc. disp.* v. 14. 42; Frontinus *Strategemata* iv. 5. 12; Valerius Maximus vi. 4. E 4). Another apophthegm may refer to a moment when Philip's requests had been presented but not officially answered—Damindas (*Apophth. Lac.* 219 E): it was observed that the Lacedaemonians would suffer terribly unless they came to terms with Philip (*ἐλ μὴ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν διαλλαγὰς ποιήσονται*).

Schaefer has arranged these and some of the other *Apophthegmata* in a different order to fit his reconstruction of events (*op. cit.*, III², 44-46). Archidamus, No. 4, and Agis, No. 14, are placed before the battle of Chaeronea; but, as has been noticed, the attendance of the Spartans at the meeting of the *naopoioi* in 338 B.C. seems to indicate that no contention had taken place publicly between them and Philip until after that date. Then, Archidamus, No. 1, and *Incert.*, No. 28, are placed after Chaeronea, but the nature of the demands is not explained by Schaefer. He considers that Philip invaded Laconia and forced the Laconians to ask for peace (there is no evidence of this) but that the terms offered were so harsh that the Spartans preferred death (hence Damindas, *Incert.*, No. 53, and the anecdote of Stobaeus). It is suggested that the terms were that Sparta should enter the League and serve against Persia; but so obdurate was the Spartan attitude that Philip yielded to it and, instead, deprived the Spartans of their border territories by a judicial decision binding on both parties to the dispute.

¹⁰⁵ Agis, No. 14 (*Apophth. Lac.* 216 A).

¹⁰⁶ Archidamus, No. 4 (*Apophth. Lac.* 218 F): in the war against Philip, some advised that battle should be joined far from their homeland, but Archidamus replied that winning was sufficient (the same story is told of Phocion, Plut. *Phocion* 16). Eudamidas, No. 4 (*Apophth. Lac.* 220 E): the citizens chose war against the Macedonians.

¹⁰⁷ Paus. iii. 24. 6, v. 4. 9, vii. 10. 3; Pol. ix. 28. 6-7, 33. 8-12; *Incert.*, No. 53 A (*Apophth. Lac.* 235 A-B); Orosius (iii. 14) linked Thebes and Sparta as suffering the penalties of executions, banishments, and confiscations at the hands of Philip. There is no other evidence of this, so that it is apparently only a perverted condensation.

¹⁰⁸ See appendix.

Asclepius, saw the god's hand in the matter and instituted a festival of Asclepius Soter.¹⁰⁹ The account must represent some Spartan popular tradition, such as Isyllos, a follower of the archaic Doric tradition, would be predisposed to fasten upon. It is another question, however, how truly it represents Philip's intentions. Wilamowitz, following the view that Philip's aim was to establish friendly governments in the Greek states, considered that Sparta was the only stumbling block to such a scheme. Philip tried to carry out his aim but failed because the bitter Spartan resistance would have made it too costly. In reprisal, the land was laid waste, and the Spartans were deprived of their border territory.¹¹⁰ The requests and the negotiations of the *Apophthegmata* would, then, refer to a demand by Philip that the Spartans depose their king and reform their political institutions. It seems a better explanation, however, that the devastation of their land and the loss of territory would, in the Spartan mind, be compounded with a blow at the very existence of their state. Isocrates' *Archidamus* reveals how the Spartans had identified the loss of Messene in 369 B.C. with the feeling that their traditional prestige and way of life were lost;¹¹¹ the adjustment of Philip was but a corollary to the policy of Epaminondas. Further, an attack on the hoary traditions of Sparta would make a much better literary theme¹¹² than would a boundary adjustment. Therefore, no

precise significance need be attached to Isyllos' words. If the question is considered in the light of Philip's other settlements, there seems no reason to believe that he envisaged the destruction of the Spartan institutions.¹¹³ He would, of course, desire friendly governments; but only in the case of Thebes is there evidence that Philip interfered personally to insure that result. Elsewhere the reversals seem to have taken place by the spontaneous action of his partisans. Thus the restored exiles and his own followers held magistracies and conducted internal purges. Similarly, where political and territorial changes had been deemed necessary, Philip had sought to give them as valid a legal sanction as possible. The Amphictyonic Council had been used to restore Phocis and grant Nicaea to Locris; the territorial transfers of Naupactus to Aetolia and of Oropus to Athens were made from enemy states which he had defeated.

Sparta, however, was not one of the enemy states opposed to Philip at Chaeronea; nor were Argos, Arcadia, and Messene among the allies who had aided him there. Since the procedure used in the other cases would not apply, a new one was devised. The changes which Philip had made *de facto* were made *de iure* by an arbitration process of the League after it was established, and the title of Philip's

¹⁰⁹ IG, IV, 950. 57-79; Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 24, 31-35.

¹¹⁰ Wilamowitz, *op. cit.*, pp. 31-35.

¹¹¹ Roebuck, *op. cit.*, p. 44. Some notion of the Spartan reaction to the loss of their territory in 338/7 B.C. may be seen in *Apophth. Lac.* 192 B: when Antiochus, serving as ephor, heard that Philip had given the land to the Messenians, he asked whether he had also given them the military power to hold it. In the *Archidamus* see, in particular, secs. 8, 12, 16, 21, 25, 48, 89, 98, and 110.

¹¹² Isyllos thought of states in such terms—see his poem A.

¹¹³ Beloch (*op. cit.*, III, 1, 574, n. 3) interprets Isyllos in a general sense only, arguing that Philip's policy was to preserve existing governments as a principle in founding the League of Corinth. That was true after the League had been founded and has some justification in the cases of Athens and the Achaean League. In many states, however, there is evidence of a change in the personnel of the government to Philip's own partisans and, since it is well known that they were wealthy oligarchs, presumably in most cases a change from democracy to oligarchy. Beloch (*ibid.*, pp. 574-75) also suggests that Sparta was not destroyed in order that its neighbors should be kept dependent on Macedonia. That, too, would be only partially true, for, in the Peloponnesus, as in central Greece, the result of Philip's changes was to establish a balance of power among small, weak states.

allies to the territories was confirmed. Philip's wishes would be known to the arbitrators and hardly disregarded. It is scarcely an objection that Sparta was not a member of the League. If the Spartans refused to sign a treaty relinquishing the territory, the only course left was to take it from them by force and then to give the transaction a legal basis through the League of Corinth.¹¹⁴ After the revolt of Agis, too, when Sparta was not a member of the League, the settlement was turned over to the *synedrion* by Antipater. This reconstruction of the settlement also accounts for the divergent tradition in our sources. The anti-Macedonian tradition, put forward by Sparta when the issue was raised on later occasions, as before Tiberius, represented it as a personal, violent act of Philip, which it was *de facto*.¹¹⁵ The pro-Macedonian tradition represented it as a legal settlement of the respective claims of the contestants, made by the League, which it was *de iure*.¹¹⁶ Tiberius, incidentally, decided the claim in favor of Messene.

If our reconstruction of this adjustment is correct, Philip then attempted to give it as valid a legal sanction as he was able, while still putting his policy, conceived in 344 B.C., into effect. The result was similar to that achieved in central Greece—a balance of power among small, weak states, with the potentially dangerous one held in check by the obligations of the others to Philip.

CONCLUSIONS

What answers may be made, from this examination of the settlements and the circumstances surrounding them, to the questions raised in the introduction? In the first place, it is to be noted that Philip

made formal treaties of settlement with the members of the anti-Macedonian coalition. It is stated only in the case of Athens that an alliance was also made; but, as has been noticed, the known terms of the treaty do not seem to indicate this. Philip apparently planned to insure alliances with both former friends and enemies by the organization of the League of Corinth as a symmarchy, which would place all the Greek states on a similar footing. Then there is no hint in the treaty terms, so far as they are known, that changes of government, either in personnel or in form, were arranged by them. It is likely that, when such changes occurred, they would, as in the case of Troezen, be spontaneous acts of Philip's partisans on receipt of the news of his victory. In some states, as in Athens and the Achaean League, there seems to have been no change. The treaties were made, then, in some cases with previously anti-Macedonian governments, which, as in the case of Achaëa, later led to trouble. There seems to be no reason to connect territorial changes with action by the League, save in the important and exceptional case of Sparta. The separate treaties or, as in the case of Nicaea, the Amphictyonic Council would have arranged the revisions.

The more general problem of whether Philip used the settlements to correct some of the political ills of Greece must be taken into account with his policy before Chaeronea and with the purpose of the new league. It is apparent that the settlements put the crowning touch on a policy which had been formulated well in advance of the opportunity to make them. Philip had endeavored to seize Ambracia in 342 B.C. and had supported the anti-Spartan bloc in the Peloponnesus in 344 B.C. Evidence appears, however, of a reasoned solution for the key problems of the various areas of Greece. The former

¹¹⁴ See appendix.

¹¹⁵ Pol. ix. 28. 7; Tac. Ann. iv. 43. 1.

¹¹⁶ Pol. ix. 33. 11–12; Tac. op. cit. iv. 43. 3.

systems of political control were destroyed—those of Thebes in central Greece, of Athens in the Aegean, of Sparta in the Peloponnesus. To replace them Philip initiated a subtle balance by building up the power of the weaker states, but none unduly. In central Greece, Phocis was restored and the influence of the Amphictyonic Council increased; in the Aegean, some of the islands were freed, some left under Athenian control; in the Peloponnesus, Argos, Arcadia, and Messene were strengthened. Thus better balances of power were set up which were not entirely sterile. They did not prevent the revolt of Thebes in 335 B.C. or the war of Agis of Sparta in 331 B.C., but they may have done something to prevent them from spreading. To create this balance, certain changes had been necessary; but Philip had been adept in finding traditional precedents for them and had sought to give them as much validity as possible by the use of treaty forms, decrees of the Amphictyonic Council, and the arbitration of the new league.¹¹⁷ Philip may be more justly criticized for displaying his military control in the garrisons of Ambracia, Thebes, Corinth, and probably Chalcis. These had, however, all been enemy states, and such a precaution should not appear unreasonable for the initial stages of a new order.¹¹⁸ Certainly, the Greeks could not complain that it was an innovation.

Philip planned that all the sovereign political organizations of Greece were to be members of the League of Corinth. The

settlements show a disposition to favor federal organizations. Of the hostile states, the Achaean, Boeotian, and Euboean leagues were apparently allowed to survive. Among his allies, Philip had mended the rift in the Arcadian League, restored the Phocian League, and added Naupactus to Aetolia and Nicaea to Locris. While this may in part be ascribed to the practical convenience of dealing with relatively few large units rather than a host of separate cities,¹¹⁹ Philip must also have hoped for a solution of political difficulties in general by federations, as, of course, his own scheme of a panhellenic league and the measures taken to form artificial combinations of states for the purpose of representation in it would indicate.

These various political remedies were not, it may be supposed, entirely altruistic. They were designed to organize Greece in Philip's interest as a quiet and co-operative ally, which would enable him to turn his attention to the projected war against Persia. But his conquest was not essentially military, and he attempted to deal with the psychological problems which arose. Care was taken to avoid personal antagonism, for only in Thebes did Philip interfere personally as a military victor in the political organization of the city. Elsewhere his partisans made the changes. Naturally, Philip allowed such reversals of government, but he may have hoped that the bitterness following upon them would be directed primarily upon their fellow-citizens by the sufferers. The League, of course, attempted to insure that no counterrevolution would take place. It was not a healthy state of affairs, but Philip tried not to leave time for antagonism and resentment to grow. As

¹¹⁷ Wüst (*op. cit.*, p. 174) has emphasized the view that Philip's territorial changes were designed to restore the "Old Order" in Greece as it was before Thebes, Athens, and Sparta had enlarged their territory at the expense of their neighbors. Emphasis on the "Old Order" was, of course, a part of his propaganda but scarcely a serious political aim. It was designed to facilitate the imposition of the Macedonian hegemony.

¹¹⁸ See above, n. 44.

¹¹⁹ This is not to suggest that the separate settlements arranged the political units which were to be represented in the League. Various combinations based on military strength were made for that purpose (for a recent study see Raue, *op. cit.*, pp. 43-66).

soon as possible, he turned the attention of the Greeks to the formation of the League and to the war on Persia, rumors of which were set in motion very soon after Chaeronea.¹²⁰ Philip failed in this re-orientation of Greek political thought, as the events after his death showed. The failure was not caused merely by lack of time for his policies to work themselves out but by the inability of Greek political thought to reconcile local "nationalism" with a true national unity.

APPENDIX

THE ARBITRATION OF THE CORINTHIAN LEAGUE FOR ARCADIA, ARGOS, MESSENE, AND SPARTA

Dr. Treves has observed (*op. cit.*, pp. 105-6) in the course of his criticism of the view of the Spartan settlement which I had previously sketched (*op. cit.*, pp. 53-57): "At the utmost, all that one can surmise is that the territories which Sparta was compelled to surrender in the autumn of 338 B.C. were then merely 'occupied' by hostile troops, and that the annexation took place, legally and formally, only after the work of the League began." This is, I think, substantially correct, except for the term "annexation" and the view of the League's activity which it implies, stated elsewhere as a "task of demarcation and guarantee" and a legalization of the status quo. His criticism is based primarily on the objection to accepting Polybius' tradition, favorable to Philip, as evidence for the period of Chaeronea. One should perhaps distinguish between Polybius' judgment (v. 10. 1; xviii. 14—his own views; ix. 33—the view put in Lyciscus' mouth) and the factual content of the material. The judgment on Philip is favorable, but the factual basis should be either disproved or established independently. Treves considers that Pol. ix. 33. 11-12 means that "the Spartans agreed, though under compulsion, to become a party to the agreement and to submit their disputes with their neighbors to the arbitration of the

League." It is objected that this procedure can scarcely be correct, for Sparta did not adhere to the symmachy until forced to do so after its defeat at Megalopolis in 331 B.C., and that the Spartans were not therefore bound by its decisions; also, that Justin (ix. 5. 1-3) states that the representatives of the member-states of the League were summoned to the constituent meeting, only after the territorial claims had been settled by the king to their satisfaction. First of all, is there any evidence besides that of Polybius for a settlement through arbitration? An inscription (Ditt., *Syll.*³, No. 665. 19-20) refers to a settlement by judicial procedure ([κ]ρ[ι]σ[ι]ς). The literary tradition, too, has preserved a somewhat confused record of a settlement by judicial process. Strabo mentions a Messenian-Lacedaemonian dispute in the time of Philip (viii. 4. 6), while Tacitus refers to it as decided *ex vero* by Philip (*op. cit.* iv. 43. 3). Pausanias records that Philip acted as arbitrator between the Argives and the Lacedaemonians (vii. 11. 2). In the case of the Arcadian-Lacedaemonian dispute, Livy has a reference to its settlement by an old decree of the "Achaeans" (xxxviii. 34. 8; is "Achaeans" written by mistake for "Hellenes," since the Achaeans are mentioned so frequently in this chapter?). Thus, this evidence taken as a whole would seem to amplify and confirm that of Polybius for an arbitrated settlement by the League. As we have noticed, Treves states that the League's activity was one of demarcation and legalization of the status quo (the state resulting from the forcible occupation of the territories); but Polybius' evidence is readmitted so far as to be interpreted that the demarcation and the guaranty are alluded to by κριτήριον (ix. 33. 12); so, too, the [κ]ρ[ι]σ[ι]ς of the inscription. Polybius, however, uses κριτήριον as object of καθίστας; κριτήριον might, in itself, be used to mean a "judgment"; but, when used with καθίστας, it can scarcely mean anything else than "tribunal" (see Liddell-Scott-Jones, *Greek Lexicon*, κριτήριον, 2). Thus Polybius' phrase will mean "setting up a tribunal," not "making a decision." What, then, was the function of this tribunal—demarcation and ratification of a boundary already established or determination of the ownership of the terri-

¹²⁰ According to Wilcken, Philip began to circulate rumors of a Persian war shortly after the separate peace with Athens (*Sitzungsber. München*, 1917, p. 13).

tory? Treves has pointed out that Aristotle drew, at Philip's request, the *dikaïomata* of the Greek states to this end of demarcation and guaranty of boundary lines. A fragment (No. 276) from the Marcian *Vita* of Aristotle indicates the purpose of the *dikaïomata*: καὶ τὰ γεγραμμένα αὐτῷ δικαίωματα Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων ἐξ ᾧ Φίλιππος τὰς φιλονεικίας τῶν Ἑλλήνων διέλυσεν, ὡς μεγαλυρρημονέσαντά ποτε καὶ εἰπεῖν ὥρισα γῆν Πέλοπος. Thus they are specifically connected with the Peloponnesian adjustments. One of the surviving fragments, however (No. 571, *Opera Aristotelis*, ed. Acad. Boruss., V, 1572) refers to the expedition of Alexander of Epirus to aid the Tarentines, which was made ca. 333 B.C. (Hackforth, *CAH*, VI, 300-301). Schaefer has suggested (*op. cit.*, III², 55, n. 1) that the *dikaïomata* were not published (according to Diog. Laert. v. 26, in one book) until the time of Alexander and were designed to counteract the rising tide of discontent against the settlements made by Philip. Nissen (*op. cit.*, pp. 168-71) resolved the difficulty by assuming that the *dikaïomata* were compiled for Philip's use but not published until later, and then in an expanded form to include "Rectifications" for the western Greek states. There is, then, some difficulty in accepting the statement in the *Vita* literally. In any case it throws no light on the action of the League but tells us only that Philip's adjustments, or his opinions on them, were based on Aristotle's researches. The procedure by which Philip made them is not mentioned. Should we not, then, accept the evidence of Polybius literally—that a tribunal was set up under the auspices of the League to act in this case and, as the evidence for *judicial* action indicates, that it decided *ownership* in favor of Philip's allies? If the League was founded to preserve the peace of Greece and organized as a symmarchy, its guaranty of the decision would be automatic. Further, the scope of its activity would extend to nonmembers, should the latter menace that peace; for, after the war of Agis in 331 B.C., Antipater referred the settlement to the *synedrion* of the League (Diod.

xvii. 73. 5; Q. Curtius vi. 1. 19). Sparta may have gone so far as not to send a representative to defend its case before the tribunal; but would that prevent a decision's being taken? That Sparta would not consider itself bound by the decision goes without saying. It had never recognized the establishment of Messene and had withdrawn from the peace conference of 362 B.C. on that account (Roebuck, *op. cit.*, p. 46). So far as the objection raised on the evidence of Justin is concerned, I think Treves has suggested the correct solution: the territories were occupied before the first meeting of the League, so that the question was settled *de facto*. Justin would scarcely notice the arbitration which confirmed it *de iure*, in such a condensed account as he gives. This distinction between the ratification of an occupation and a determination of ownership by the League might seem to be trivial. So far as the practical result was concerned, it made no difference; but the procedure was important. It was in accordance with Philip's usual gilding of the bitter pill, as, for example, in his use of the Amphictyonic Council both in 346 and in 338 B.C.; and it would establish a precedent for what, in the course of time, might prove to be an equitable method of procedure in territorial disputes. The League did make use of such procedure by arbitration in the subsequent case between Cimolus and Melos, which was referred to Argos (Ditt., *Syll.*³, No. 261; Larsen, *CP*, XXI [1926], 55). The case of Sparta was of more importance and thus needed a larger tribunal picked from the League members; possibly the *synedrion* acted as a committee for the purpose. Other territorial adjustments were, of course, made after Chaeronea, but, as we have noticed, they were a part of the separate treaties made with enemy states or handled through the Amphictyonic Council. Accordingly, there seems to be no reason to suppose that territorial adjustments were a regular part of the League's work at the time of its foundation.

DALHOUSIE UNIVERSITY
HALIFAX, CANADA

PAGAN EXAMPLES OF FORTITUDE IN THE LATIN CHRISTIAN APOLOGISTS

MARY LOUISE CARLSON

THE special skill of the Church Fathers in argument and their methods of persuasion can in many cases be traced directly to their rhetorical training. A well-established rhetorical device which will serve to illustrate in a specific way the contribution of pagan educational precepts to the spread of the new faith is the use of argument by historical examples. In what follows, our object is to show that the Christians from Minucius Felix and Tertullian to Augustine not only employed argument by example to add conviction to their doctrines but even borrowed many of the examples which Roman writers and speakers had cited, turning them to their new purposes.

Ancient rhetoricians gave careful attention to defining the example and prescribed many rules for its use.¹ The citing of examples is, indeed, essential to the art of persuasion. According to Aristotle, example (*παράδειγμα*) is the rhetorical form of induction.² Example may consist, he says, of the citing of (1) historical events as proof or (2) comparisons devised by the speaker, such as parallels drawn from everyday life or myths and fables.³ He states that for deliberative speakers the most suitable kind of amplification is the historical example, since from the past we predict and judge the future.⁴ Latin rhetoricians also used "example" as a generic term to include both those comparisons derived from history and those invented

by the speaker.⁵ Definitions of the *exemplum*, however, seem to emphasize history, that is, the actual deeds or sayings of some person, as the basic source for examples.⁶

Because an appeal to the noble actions of men in the past proved to be an effective kind of argument, rhetoricians began to associate the names of outstanding persons in history with specific virtues. Thus there was gradually developed a "canon" of examples of virtue. For the convenience of speakers, textbooks were compiled which listed these examples under the virtue that they represented.⁷ Notable among the collections extant today is the work of Valerius Maximus, entitled *Factorum et dictorum memorabilium libri novem*. This collection provides examples both from Roman and from foreign history illustrative of almost one hundred topics.

The works of Cicero and of the younger Seneca provide a veritable gallery for the portrayal of Roman virtues and show how examples may induce persuasion and moral instruction. These writers well illustrate the rhetorical principle that examples may be used not only to bolster

¹ Cic. *De orat.* II. 40. 169; Quint. *Inst.* v. 11. 1-2, 6.

² See references in n. 5; also *Rhet. ad Her.* IV. 49. 62; Cic. *Inv.* I. 30. 49.

³ See H. W. Litchfield, "National exempla virtutis in Roman Literature," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, Vol. XXV (1914); also Clemens Bosch, *Die Quellen des Valerius Maximus: Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung der Litteratur der historischen Exempla* (Stuttgart, 1929); Alfred Klotz, "Zur Litteratur der Exempla und zur Epitoma Livii," *Hermes*, Vol. XLIV (1909). For Greek and Roman models of virtue cited by the Stoics see E. V. Arnold, *Roman Stoicism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1911), pp. 295-97.

¹ See esp. Arist. *Rhet.* I. 2. 8, II. 20; *Rhet. ad Her.* II. 29. 46, IV. 49. 62; Cic. *Inv.* I. 30. 49, *De orat.* II. 40. 169; Quint. *Inst.* v. 11 (see Karl Alewell, *Über das rhetorische παράδειγμα* [Leipzig, 1913]).

² Arist. *Rhet.* I. 2. 8.

³ *Ibid.* II. 20. 2-3. ⁴ *Ibid.* I. 9. 40, II. 20. 8.

proof but also to clarify, vivify, and embellish a discourse.⁸ Because of the comprehensive scope and application of ancient oratory,⁹ it is not surprising to find that philosophical and moral treatises, as well as deliberative and epideictic speeches, were fashioned with the aid of the rhetorician's precepts.

The Christian Fathers, who had a multitude of moral lessons to impart and elaborate doctrines to elucidate, experienced a particular need for the aid of examples in argumentation. In searching for examples of conduct, they often resorted to Latin literature, to which they were admittedly indebted and which was so abundantly supplied with instances of virtue. The church was not by any means devoid of examples of its own, for the Old and New Testaments provide a vast store of illustrative anecdotes and models of virtue. The courageous deeds of martyrs also were continually enriching the fund of Christian examples. Yet in apologetic literature, above all, the Church Fathers seem to have felt that there was a decided advantage to be gained from refuting pagan opponents with their own arguments and therefore with their own examples. The Christians had recourse to the time-honored instances of the rhetoricians because they were a familiar part of their own education and because they would carry weight with a large share of their readers.

Pagan examples, although most frequent in apology, are found throughout early Christian literature—in biblical commentaries, moral treatises, and anti-

heretical works. There are only a few exceptions to their widespread use by the Church Fathers. Cyprian, at least in those works which are undoubtedly genuine, avoided pagan examples and depended almost entirely upon scriptural citations. Ambrose, who appropriated large portions of Cicero to Christian uses, prefers, in general, to substitute biblical for pagan examples. The sermons of Augustine, furthermore, may be contrasted with his other writings because of their lack of classical *exempla*. Apart from these important exceptions, the works of the Christian Fathers abound in examples from Greek and Roman history.

As a means of determining the importance of pagan examples in the preaching of Christian doctrine, it will be useful to compare Roman and patristic discussions of virtue. We have chosen to consider fortitude, since it was one of the cardinal virtues both for the ancients and for the Christians. After summarizing some general discussions of fortitude, we shall cite passages from Christian literature which employ pagan examples of that virtue. Our purpose is not to point to specific sources, but we shall indicate some pagan precedents for the examples used by the Church Fathers.

Fortitudo, as defined by Cicero in *De officiis*,¹⁰ embraces patience and endurance, as well as the aggressive kind of courage that seeks out difficult and perilous tasks. The brave man is indifferent to external circumstances, since he is convinced that nothing is to be esteemed or desired except moral uprightness and propriety.¹¹ Cicero stresses the association of endurance and fortitude also in the *Tusculan Disputations*. Here he states that the main functions of fortitude are the scorn

⁸ Cic. *De orat.* iii. 53. 205; cf. also *Rhet. ad Her.* ii. 29. 46, iv. 49. 62. Concerning the use of *exemplum* for moral purposes see Cic. *De orat.* ii. 82. 335; *Prot. cons.* 8. 20; cf. also Hor. *Serm.* i. 4. 105-6.

⁹ Cicero (*De orat.* iii. 20. 76) maintains that the province of oratory is everything that affects the conduct and life of mankind; also (*ibid.* iii. 35. 143) in the perfect orator is found all the knowledge of the philosophers.

¹⁰ For Cicero's discussion of fortitude see *Off.* i. 18. 61-26. 92.

¹¹ *Ibid.* i. 20. 66.

of death and of pain.¹² This opinion is held likewise by the philosopher Seneca, who considers *patientia* an essential attribute of *fortitudo*.¹³

Examples often cited by the Romans to personify the combination of bravery and endurance are Mucius Scaevola, famous for his courage in thrusting his right arm into the fire on Porsena's altar; Regulus, tortured by the Carthaginians; Socrates, who preferred to suffer death by the poison hemlock rather than sacrifice his principles; Rutilius Rufus, who endured unjust conviction and exile; and Cato of Utica, who committed suicide rather than be subject to Caesar. This particular series of examples, sometimes in different order or with one or two names omitted or added, is found frequently in Seneca.¹⁴

Even though Roman philosophers urge that fortitude should be summoned every day to combat the difficulties with which one is faced, yet this virtue was often associated especially with patriotism and the defense of the state. The first allegiance of a Roman was to his native land, and that loyalty entailed a readiness to defy danger and to lay down one's life in battle.¹⁵ Cicero admits that the orators will find the hunting ground for brave deeds to be the field of battle and lists as examples of martial valor Horatius Cocles, the Decii, Cn. and P. Scipio, and M. Marcellus.¹⁶ Almost all the examples of Roman bravery which Valerius Maximus cites in his chapter "De fortitudine"¹⁷ took place at the scene of battle.

¹² Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 18. 43; v. 14. 41; cf. also *Off.* iii. 33. 117; *Fin.* iii. 8. 29; *Inu.* ii. 54. 163.

¹³ *Epist.* 67. 6, 10.

¹⁴ *Ibid.* 24. 3-11; 67. 7-13; 98. 12.

¹⁵ Cic. *Off.* i. 17. 57. Cf. Lucil. (*apud* Lact. *Inst.* vi. 5. 3): "Virtus, Albine, est . . . comoda praeterea patriae prima putare, deinde parentum, tertia iam postremaque nostra"; see also Val. Max. v. 6.

¹⁶ Cic. *Off.* i. 18. 61.

¹⁷ Val. Max. iii. 2.

The Church Fathers were considerably aided in their efforts to define fortitude by the specifications already laid down by the Romans, whose very system it was their purpose to improve or refute. That pagan philosophic treatises might serve as a point of departure for the Christians is shown by Ambrose's work, *De officiis ministrorum*, which follows the contents and general arrangement of Cicero's *De officiis*.

Ambrose agrees with Cicero that fortitude cannot be divorced from justice but must be concerned with repelling evil.¹⁸ The statements of Cicero which appeal to him above all deal with fortitude as a discipline of the mind. Thus, according to Ambrose, the brave man does not yield to fear, anger, or the enticements of pleasure but, preferring uprightness and propriety, remains indifferent to outward circumstances.¹⁹ Ambrose also believes with Cicero that, in striving toward fortitude, one must beware of an overweening ambition for glory.²⁰

Departing from Cicero's threefold conception of fortitude, which involves the soldier, the statesman, and the ordinary citizen, Ambrose actually exhorts his readers, that is, his clergy, to abstain from secular affairs.²¹ He says that his discussion will be little concerned with the bravery that is displayed in war, since churchmen are devoted to the duties of the soul rather than of the body. Still he proves by reference to Samson, David, Joshua, and others that the history of the church is not lacking in great soldiers.²² He gives warmest praise to the martyrs, who, in contrast to soldiers surrounded by

¹⁸ Ambr. *Off.* i. 35. 176, 36. 178; Cic. *Off.* i. 19. 62-65. For Ambrose's discussion of fortitude see *Off.* i. 35. 175-42. 208.

¹⁹ Ambr. *Off.* i. 36. 180-81; Cic. *Off.* i. 20. 66-70.

²⁰ Ambr. *Off.* i. 39. 193; Cic. *Off.* i. 20. 68.

²¹ Ambr. *Off.* i. 36. 184; cf. also II Tim. 2:4.

²² Ambr. *Off.* i. 35. 175, 177; 40. 195-41. 200.

legions, gained their triumph singlehanded from the faithless through sheer moral courage.²³

Few of the Church Fathers would grant even as much credit to martial valor as Ambrose gives. Lactantius, for instance, ridicules the belief that immortality can be attained by commanding armies, devastating the fields of others, destroying cities, and killing or enslaving free peoples. With reference to Scipio Africanus, he remarks that the Romans are inconsistent not only because they give to their crimes the name of virtue but also because they abhor the murderer of one man and yet admit to heaven the slayer of thousands.²⁴

The Christians, despising motives of honor and praise, which they attributed to the Romans, devoted themselves to the principle that true glory is derived from God alone.²⁵ In *De doctrina Christiana*, Augustine describes fortitude as "the fourth step toward wisdom, in which the Christian, hungering and thirsting after righteousness, withdraws from every fatal pleasure in transitory joys and turns his affections toward things eternal."²⁶

Thus the Church Fathers clearly placed a Christian stamp upon their definitions of fortitude. Nonetheless, they persisted in drawing upon the stock of pagan examples when urging Christians to courageous conduct. So universal is the need for fortitude that one of the most enduring heritages which one age can bequeath to another lies in the deeds of brave men.

There was already at hand the dialectical means to aid in the adapting of pagan examples for Christian use—argument

from the lesser to the greater.²⁷ If certain pagans were acknowledged to be courageous, surely the Christians, by being reminded of these models of fortitude, could be spurred on with hopes of eternal reward to emulate and surpass their feats. As will be observed from the passages cited below, the Christians resorted to this argument again and again.

Minucius Felix, for instance, through the lips of Octavius Januarius, the main speaker in his dialogue, describes the glories of Christian martyrdom but mentions no martyr by name. Instead, in an argument from the lesser to the greater, which has the added effect of disparaging the pagan examples cited, he recalls to mind the Romans, Mucius Scaevola, Aquilius, and Regulus. By this device he meets his pagan opponent in the dialogue on his own ground. He says:

You praise to the skies unfortunate men like Mucius Scaevola, who, since he had blundered in his attempt upon the king, would have perished among the enemy had he not destroyed his right hand. How many from our number have without a moan endured the consumption by fire not only of their right hand but even of their whole body when it was in their power to be set free! Do I compare men with Mucius or Aquilius or Regulus? No—our boys and frail women with inspired endurance of pain mock at crosses and tortures, wild beasts, and all the horrors of punishment.²⁸

Tertullian is equally general about the deeds of Christian martyrs and speaks at even greater length concerning pagan bravery. His method in *Ad martyras*²⁹ is similar to that of Minucius Felix, without

²³ *Ibid.* i. 35. 178, 41. 201-6. Although the Christian Fathers deplored the brutality of war, they were very partial to the use of metaphors drawn from military service (cf. Tert. *Apol.* 50; Cypr. *Epist.* 8; Ambr. *Off.* i. 39. 192).

²⁴ Lact. *Inst.* i. 18.

²⁵ Aug. *Cic. dei* v. 13-14; cf. also Cic. *Rep.* v. 7. 9; *Tusc.* i. 2. 4, ii. 20. 46.

²⁶ Aug. *Doctr. Christ.* ii. 7. 10.

²⁷ Arist. *Rhet.* ii. 23. 4-5; Cic. *Top.* 4. 23. 18. 68; *De orat.* ii. 40. 172; Quint. *Inst.* v. 10. 86-87, 11. 9-12.

²⁸ Min. Felix 37. See below for further discussion of Mucius Scaevola, Aquilius, and Regulus.

²⁹ Tert. *Mart.* 4. Tertullian cites very similar lists of pagan examples of fortitude in *Apol.* 50 and *Ad nat.* i. 18. Unfortunately, I have been unable to see Hélène Pétré. *L'Exemplum chez Tertullien* (Paris dissertation; Neully-sur-Seine, 1940).

the complication, however, of disparaging the pagan examples. Tertullian says:

Perhaps the flesh will fear the cruel sword, the high cross, the fury of wild beasts, and fire, the worst of all agonies, and the refined skill of the torturer. But let the soul set before itself and the flesh those torments, however painful, calmly endured by many, nay even gladly sought, for the sake of fame and glory, not only by men but by women also.

Then follows an array of pagans cited for their bravery, including Lucretia, Mucius Scaevola, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Peregrinus, Dido, the wife of Hasdrubal, Regulus, Cleopatra, the Athenian meretricious Leana, and the Spartan youths who withstood the ordeal of flagellation. Tertullian concludes that Christians, whose reward is in heaven, should certainly count as light those tortures which others have suffered for earthly glory. "If something made of glass is so precious, what must the true pearl be worth?"

A brief review of Tertullian's list will indicate, surely in the case of the Roman examples, his debt to pagan history and rhetoric, as well as his ingenuity in searching for arguments. Lucretia, the first name in his list in *Ad martyras*, was described by Valerius Maximus as *dux Romanae pudicitiae*,³⁰ and her suicide was a subject for declamation in the schools.³¹ Quintilian declared that her example, since she was a woman, would carry more weight even than that of Cato and Scipio in urging a person to face death.³² Tertullian and his successors, who often cite Lucretia in their discussions of chastity and fortitude,³³ added many more years to her fame as an example of conduct.

³⁰ Val. Max. vi. 1. 1; cf. Liv. 1. 58.

³¹ Empor. *Rhet. Lat. min.* 572. 27 (ed. Halm); cf. also Sen. *Contr.* 1. 5. 3; *Exc. contr.* vi. 8. For themes declaimed in the schools of rhetoric see Richard Kohl, *De scholasticarum declamationum argumentis ex historia petitis* (Paderborn, 1915).

³² Quint. *Inst.* v. 11. 10.

³³ Tert. *Mart.* 4; *Monog.* 17; *Exhort. cast.* 13; *Hier. Epist.* 123. 7; *Adv. Iov.* 1. 46; *Aug. Civ. dei* 1. 19.

Mucius Scaevola and Regulus (discussed more fully below) are justly included in Tertullian's enumeration of pagan bravery because of their renown in antiquity. For the citing of the philosophers Heraclitus and Empedocles as men who displayed fortitude in death (also Anaxarchus and Zeno of Elea, mentioned in *Apologeticum* 50) he could find a precedent in Roman and in Greek writers.³⁴ Mention of these philosophers had been made also by the Greek apologists. Tatian, for example, refers to the death of Heraclitus, Zeno, and Empedocles, but in a manner quite uncomplimentary to them.³⁵ In admiring the bravery of Peregrinus Proteus, Tertullian takes a different attitude toward him than the one found in certain disparaging passages in Greek apology.³⁶ In the light of Cleopatra's reputation for extravagance and degenerate morals,³⁷ she, too, appears as somewhat of a surprise in this list. Tertullian commends her courage in dying by means of asps, which are more to be dreaded, he says, than the bull and the bear of the arena. Perhaps it was Cleopatra's intrepid conduct and her proud bearing which appealed to him very much as they had to Horace, who, although condemning her manner of living, admires her exit from life.³⁸

Tertullian praises Dido and the wife of Hasdrubal as women who fearlessly met death by fire. In appropriating the example of Dido, he does not adhere to the familiar Vergilian account, which describes Dido throwing herself upon the funeral pyre in despair and humiliation

³⁴ Cf. Cic. *Nat. deor.* iii. 33. 82; *Tusc.* ii. 22. 52; Val. Max. iii. 3. *ext.* 2, 4; Plin. *HN* vii. 23. 87; Philo *Quod omnis probus liber* 16; Plut. *De Stoic. rep.* 37. 3.

³⁵ Tat. 3; for Zeno and Anaxarchus, cf. Clem. *Al. Strom.* iv. 8.

³⁶ Tat. 25; Athenag. *Leg. ad Chr.* 26; see also Luc. *De morte Peregr.*

³⁷ Cf. Propert. iii. 11. 39; Plin. *HN* xxxiii. 3. 50.

³⁸ Hor. *Carm.* i. 37; cf. Vell. ii. 87.

when forsaken by Aeneas.³⁹ He prefers an earlier version, more in keeping with Christian doctrine concerning marriage, which attributes Dido's death to her fidelity to the memory of Sychaeus and her unwillingness to marry Iarbas and thus be wed a second time.⁴⁰ In *Ad martyras* he says of the wife of Hasdrubal that she leaped with her children into the flames of burning Carthage so that she might not behold her husband a suppliant of Scipio. Perhaps because Tertullian himself was from Africa, he often appealed to the brave example of the heroines of Carthage. In *Ad nationes* he says that it was Dido who taught the wife of Hasdrubal to be more resolute than her husband in Carthage's last hour and to seek death through fire.⁴¹ Cicero and Seneca, whose works generally contain the pagan examples found in the Church Fathers, do not mention the wife of Hasdrubal; but her story is told by Livy, Valerius Maximus, Florus, and Appian.⁴²

The fortitude of Leana impresses Tertullian, who is especially eager to find examples of feminine bravery for the encouragement of Christian women. Implicated in the plot of Harmodius and Aristogeiton to kill the Peisistratidae, Leana refused to yield to the tortures of her questioner and finally spat out her tongue in his face so that any confession would be impossible. She is mentioned by Pliny the Elder as an outstanding instance among women of *patientia corporis*.⁴³ Her fortitude seems

³⁹ Verg. *Aen.* iv. 648 ff.

⁴⁰ See Thelma DeGraff, *Naevian Studies*, chap. II (Columbia dissertation, 1931). For Christian references to Dido see Tert. *Mart.* 4; *Apol.* 50; *Monog.* 17; Hier. *Epist.* 123. 7, 13; *Adv. Iov.* i. 43; Aug. *Confess.* i. 13. 21.

⁴¹ Tert. *Ad nat.* i. 18; cf. also ii. 9. Cf. Flor. i. 31. 17; Oros. iv. 23. 4; Hier. *Adv. Iov.* i. 43; *Epist.* 123. 7; *In Eph.* iii. 5. 25. Jerome cites the wife of Hasdrubal not only as an example of fortitude but also as a model of conjugal devotion.

⁴² Liv. *Epit.* 51; Val. Max. iii. 2. *ext.* 8; Flor. i. 31. 17; App. viii. 131.

⁴³ Plin. *HN* vii. 23. 87; cf. also xxxiv. 8. 72.

highly admirable to Tertullian, since, as he remarks, the fear of torture is harder to overcome than the fear of death.⁴⁴

Tertullian ends his discussion of pagan bravery in *Ad martyras* by reminding Christians of the powers of endurance displayed by Spartan youths when scourged before the eyes of their parents at a solemn rite of Artemis. The Spartan ordeal of flagellation was a stock *exemplum* which had been used by Cicero and Seneca in discussions concerning the endurance of pain.⁴⁵

Arnobius, a Christian writer who was notorious for depending on authorities other than Holy Writ, very naturally finds use for pagan examples. His purpose is to show that the teachings of Christ are in no way invalidated by the humiliating death which He suffered on the cross. He says:

Pythagoras of Samos, under an unjust suspicion of despotism, was burned alive in a temple, but did his doctrines lose any of their force because he died not willingly but as the result of a cruel attack? Likewise Socrates was condemned to death by the judgment of his fellow-citizens, but were his discussions on conduct, virtues, and duties made invalid since he was unjustly thrust from life? Countless others, outstanding in fame, virtue, and esteem, experienced the most painful kinds of death, such as Aquilius, Trebonius, and Regulus, but were they therefore judged at all base after death because they perished not by the common law of fate but were mutilated and tortured in a very cruel death? No innocent person wrongfully slain is ever thereby disgraced.⁴⁶

Arnobius' argument is very similar to that of his Greek predecessor, Athenagoras, who cites Pythagoras, Heraclitus,

⁴⁴ Tert. *Mart.* 4; cf. also *Apol.* 50; *Ad nat.* i. 18. See also Lact. *Inst.* i. 20. 3-4; Ambr. *De virginibus* i. 4. 17-19.

⁴⁵ Cic. *Tusc.* ii. 14. 34, 20. 46; v. 27. 77; Sen. *Prov.* 4. 11; Tert. *Mart.* 4; *Apol.* 50; *Ad nat.* i. 18.

⁴⁶ Arnob. *Adv. nat.* i. 40.

Democritus, and Socrates to show that, just as the virtue of these men was not affected by popular opinion, so indiscriminate slander does not throw a shadow upon the moral uprightness of Christians.⁴⁷ The Greek apologists had often referred to the example of Pythagoras and especially of Socrates.⁴⁸ In adding the examples of Aquilius, Trebonius, and Regulus, however, Arnobius draws from Roman precedent. Aquilius perished at the hands of Mithridates, who is said to have poured molten gold down his throat as a punishment of Roman avarice.⁴⁹ Cicero had used Aquilius, with Regulus and Q. Servilius Caepio, as examples of good men who suffered signal misfortune.⁵⁰ Trebonius, who took part in the conspiracy against Julius Caesar, was brutally murdered when proconsul of Asia by Dolabella. Trebonius is highly idealized by Cicero.⁵¹

Lactantius employs pagan examples to help demonstrate his conviction that immortality is the highest goal toward which men can strive and for which they can suffer pain and death. He declares:

The men who voluntarily sacrificed their life for the safety of their country, such as Menoeceus at Thebes, Codrus at Athens, and Curtius and the two Mures [Decii] at Rome, would never have preferred death to the advantages of life unless they had thought that they would achieve immortality through the esteem of their fellow-citizens. Although these men were ignorant of the path to true im-

mortality, they did not neglect the consideration of immortality.⁵²

The examples cited by Lactantius were men from history or legend who had, with great courage, dedicated their life to their country. The Decii, father and son, are among the favorite *exempla virtutis* of the Romans. Their bravery is described in Valerius Maximus' chapter, "De pietate erga patriam."⁵³ For allusions to the Decii, singly or together, we may refer to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero, Vergil, Livy, Florus, the Senecas, Pliny the Elder, Juvenal, and Quintilian.⁵⁴ The story of M. Curtius, who leaped with his horse in full armor into the chasm in the Forum, may be found in Livy, Varro, Valerius Maximus, Seneca the Elder, and Pliny the Elder.⁵⁵ Horace lauds Codrus, said to be the last of the kings of Athens, as *pro patria non timidus mori*. Codrus is praised also by Cicero and Valerius Maximus.⁵⁶ Menoeceus, who put an end to his life because an oracle had declared that his death would bring victory to Thebes, is mentioned by Cicero side by side with Codrus in a discussion of famous deaths on behalf of country.⁵⁷ From the repetition of references in the notes, it will be observed that there is abundant ancient authority not only for the examples cited by Lactantius but also for the same gen-

⁴⁷ Athenag. *Leg. ad Chr.* 31.

⁴⁸ For Pythagoras and Socrates cf. Orig. *Cels.* 1. 3; iii. 25. For Socrates cf. Justin. *Ap.* 1. 5, 46; ii. 7, 10; Orig. *Cels.* ii. 17, 41; vii. 56 (see J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten* [Leipzig, 1907], pp. 229-30). For Socrates as an example of fortitude in Roman writers cf. Cic. *Tusc.* i. 40. 97-42. 100; iii. 17. 36; Quint. *Inst.* xi. 1. 9-10; see also n. 14 and text above. For Pythagoras cf. Cic. *Tusc.* iii. 17. 36.

⁴⁹ Plin. *HN* xxxiii. 3. 48; cf. Min. Felix 37.

⁵⁰ Cic. *Tusc.* v. 5. 14.

⁵¹ Cic. *Phil.* xi. 1. 1-4. 9; xii. 10. 25.

⁵² Lact. *Inst.* iii. 12. 22.

⁵³ Val. Max. v. 6. 5-6.

⁵⁴ *Rhet. ad Her.* iv. 44. 57; Cic. *Off.* iii. 4. 16; *Tusc.* ii. 24. 59; *Div.* i. 24. 51; *Cat. M.* 13. 43, 20. 75; *Parad.* 1. 12; Verg. *Geor.* ii. 169; *Aen.* vi. 824; *Culex* 361; Liv. vii. 34-37; viii. 9-10; x. 27-28; Flor. 1. 14. 3, 17. 7; Sen. *Contr.* x. 2. 3; Sen. *Benef.* iv. 27; vi. 36; *Epist.* 67. 9; Plin. *HN* xxii. 5. 5; Juv. 8. 254-59; Quint. *Inst.* xii. 2. 30. For references in Cicero to three famous Decii see *Tusc.* i. 37. 89 and *Fin.* ii. 19. 61; but for mention of only two see *Off.* iii. 4. 16 and *Cat. M.* 20. 75.

⁵⁵ Liv. vii. 6; Varr. *LL* v. 148; Val. Max. v. 6. 2; Sen. *Exc. contr.* viii. 4; Plin. *HN* xv. 18. 20; also Verg. *Culex* 363-64.

⁵⁶ Hor. *Carm.* iii. 19. 2; Cic. *Tusc.* i. 48. 116; Val. Max. v. 6. *est.* 1. Cf. Sen. *Exc. contr.* viii. 4.

⁵⁷ Cic. *Tusc.* i. 48. 116.

eral sequence or grouping of names which are enumerated.⁵⁸ This tradition, revived by Lactantius, was carried further by Jerome and Augustine, as the next two citations will indicate.

Jerome, like Lactantius, feels no compunction in using this series of pagan examples of fortitude to add authority to Holy Writ. He exclaims: "Certainly if we trust the accounts of the pagans that Codrus, Curtius, and the Decii by means of their death checked plagues, famine, and wars of cities, how much more can we believe that the Son of God by the shedding of His blood cleansed not one city but the whole world!"⁵⁹

Augustine, questioning the judgment of the Romans in choosing deities worthy of reverence, asks:

Why is not fortitude a goddess, who aided Mucius when he placed his right hand in the flames; who aided Curtius when for his country's sake he threw himself headlong into the gaping earth; who aided Decius the father and Decius the son when they dedicated their lives to the army?—though we might ask whether these men had true fortitude, if this concerned our present discussion.⁶⁰

Tertullian's extended review of pagan examples discussed above, is matched by Augustine in *De civitate dei* v. 18. In this chapter Augustine describes the deeds of one famous Roman after another and declares that "the magnificence of the Roman Empire and the brilliant deeds of its great men can serve to warn the Christians that they should be stung with shame if, for the sake of the most glorious City of God, they do not adhere to those virtues which are in some way resembled

by the virtues which the Romans upheld for the glory of a terrestrial city." Among the examples used by Augustine, several—Camillus, Mucius Scaevola, Curtius, the Decii, and Regulus—relate to fortitude and patriotism. The entire passage is too long to quote in full, but Augustine's remarks on Camillus will serve to illustrate further his skill in adapting pagan examples to Christian themes.

Augustine argues:

If Furius Camillus, who had cast from the necks of the Romans the yoke of the Veientes, their bitterest enemy, and who had been condemned by envious rivals, again freed his ungrateful country, this time from the Gauls, . . . why should the Christian be praised, as though he did something noble, who perchance suffering in the church a most grievous injury and dishonor from carnal enemies, did not turn to her heretical enemies or found some heresy against her, but rather defended her with all his strength against the most ruinous perversity of heretics?⁶¹

Considerations of fortitude by the Christians might well be expected to take notice of Cato of Utica, whose resolution in death received almost universal acclaim from pagan writers. In *De finibus* Cicero has Cato present the Stoic view concerning suicide.⁶² In the *Tusculan Disputations* and also in *De officiis* his suicide was upheld as justifiable and praiseworthy.⁶³ Valerius Maximus lists him among the prominent examples of fortitude,⁶⁴ and the story of his death was employed for purposes of composition and argument in the schools of rhetoric. In a *suasoria* related by Seneca the Elder, Cicero is exhorted to follow the example

⁵⁸ See esp. *ibid.* (Codrus, Menoeceus, and others); Verg. *Culex* 361-71 (Decii, Curtius, Mucius, and others); Sen. *Exc. contr.* viii. 4 (Cato, Curtius, Mucius, Codrus); Val. Max. v. 6. (Curtius, Decii, Codrus, and others).

⁵⁹ Hier. *In Eph.* i. 1. 7.

⁶⁰ Aug. *Civ. dei* iv. 20; cf. *ibid.* v. 14 for another reference to Mucius, Curtius, and the Decii.

⁶¹ *Ibid.* v. 18. For pagan use of Camillus as an exemplum see Cic. *Tusc.* i. 37. 90; *Rep.* i. 3. 6; Verg. *Geor.* ii. 169; *Aen.* vi. 825; *Culex* 362; Hor. *Carm.* i. 12. 42; Val. Max. iv. 1. 2; v. 3. 2; i. 5. 2; Sen. *Suas.* vii. 6.

⁶² Cic. *Fin.* iii. 18. 60-61.

⁶³ Cic. *Tusc.* i. 30. 74; *Off.* i. 31. 112.

⁶⁴ Val. Max. iii. 2. 14.

of Cato in seeking death rather than beg Antony for mercy.⁶⁵ The poet Persius recalls his youthful impressions on reciting in school a deathbed speech of Cato.⁶⁶ At almost every opportunity the younger Seneca warmly eulogizes Cato and admits that, whenever a discussion arises concerning the scorn of death, he immediately comes to mind.⁶⁷ Passages in Vergil, Horace, and Lucan indicate his popularity among the poets.⁶⁸

The Church Fathers frequently mention Cato of Utica, but for them his fortitude was overshadowed by his sin in committing suicide. Because of the extravagant tribute of the Romans, it is not surprising that something of a reaction against him was felt by the Christians. Lactantius describes Cato as an "imitator of Stoic ostentation throughout his whole life"⁶⁹ and says that, since he was a destroyer of human life (his own), he is guilty of homicide. His motive, according to Lactantius, was not so much to escape Caesar as to obey the decrees of the Stoics and to glorify his name by some lofty deed. Jerome relegates such martyrs as Cato to a "foolish philosophy."⁷⁰ Augustine, besides condemning suicide, tries to show that Cato is not a model of virtue even according to pagan standards. He says that Cato's friends, also learned men, wisely attempted to dissuade him from the act. As a second argument, Augustine asks, "If it was dishonorable for Cato to

live under Caesar's rule, why did he submit his son to that disgrace by urging him to take advantage of Caesar's liberality?"⁷¹

Augustine also discredits the example of Cato when he criticizes the Stoic doctrine that the supreme good can be attained in this life and that the wise man is happy by reason of his own resources, no matter what multitude of evils oppresses him. Augustine contends that if this life is happy, it ought not to be abandoned by suicide. He asks: "Was it because of endurance, or rather lack of endurance, that Cato killed himself? He would not have committed this act had he been able to tolerate Caesar's victory. What, then, has become of his fortitude? It has, in truth, departed, surrendered, and is so completely overcome that it has relinquished, forsaken, and fled this happy life!"⁷²

Thus Cato continues to provide material for a lively debate on fortitude. Even though the apologists refuse to admit him into either the Christian or the pagan canon of examples of bravery, yet they do not refrain from the mention of his celebrated death.

The abundant references by the Church Fathers to Mucius Scaevola and Regulus merit some additional notice. Minucius Felix, Tertullian, Lactantius, and Augustine all speak of Mucius Scaevola.⁷³ Although not conspicuous among the examples in Cicero, he was foremost among the instances of *patientia* in classical literature. He stands first in the list of Valerius Maximus, and his popularity with rhetoricians is also attested by Seneca the Elder and Quintilian.⁷⁴ His most enthusiastic eulogist was Seneca the Younger, whose

⁶⁵ Sen. *Suas.* vi. 2, 4, 10; Cf. *Exc. contr.* viii. 4.

⁶⁶ Pers. iii. 44-47.

⁶⁷ Sen. *Epist.* 24. 6: "decantatae, inquit, in omnibus scholis fabulae istae sunt: iam mihi, cum ad contemnendam mortem ventum fuerit, Catonem narrabis." Cf. *Prov.* ii. 9-12; *Epist.* 24. 7; *Cons. Marc.* 22. 3; see also n. 14 above.

⁶⁸ Verg. *Aen.* viii. 670; Hor. *Carm.* i. 12. 35-36, ii. 1. 24; Lucan i. 128.

⁶⁹ Lact. *Inst.* iii. 18: "et ex Romanis Cato, qui fuit in omni sua vita Stoicae vanitatis imitator" (following the text of Brandt and Laubmann, in the "Corpus scriptorum ecclesiasticorum Latinorum" ed. [1890]).

⁷⁰ Hier. *Epist.* 39. 3.

⁷¹ Aug. *Civ. dei* i. 23.

⁷² *Ibid.* xix. 4.

⁷³ Min. Felix 37; Tert. *Mart.* 4; *Apol.* 50; *De anima* 58; Lact. *Inst.* v. 13. 13; Aug. *Civ. dei* iv. 20, v. 14, 18.

⁷⁴ Val. Max. iii. 3. 1; Sen. *Exc. contr.* viii. 4; x. 2. 3, 5; Quint. *Inst.* xii. 2. 30.

works contain many allusions to his courageous deed.⁷⁵

The apologists consistently refer to the fortitude of Mucius Scaevola in arguments from the lesser to the greater, so that the endurance of pain by Christian martyrs may seem all the more remarkable by comparison. They often go out of their way to question his motive in thrusting his hand into the fire. Minucius Felix suggests that Mucius burned his hand in order to save his life; Tertullian says that he did so as a means of gaining fame; and Lactantius goes so far as to assert that he placed his hand upon the altar so that he might make amends to Porsena for his attempt upon his life and by this self-inflicted punishment "receive a pardon which he did not deserve."⁷⁶ Yet the numerous and spirited allusions to Mucius Scaevola by the Church Fathers show that his courage made a vivid impression. Perhaps bitter experience, as well as the lessons of the rhetoricians, caused his example to be fresh in the minds of the Christians. From Martial⁷⁷ it is well known that criminals were compelled to act the part of Scaevola in the arena. More than one unfortunate Christian may have been forced to play this role. Torture by fire, in any event, was a grim reality to the martyrs.

Of all the pagan examples cited by the apologists, Regulus evoked from them the greatest measure of unqualified admiration. Even though the reports of his tortures may originally have been invented by the Romans in order to justify their mistreatment of Carthaginian captives, his name was destined to survive as a symbol of courage. Latin literature resounds with the praise of Regulus, and he

had a long history as an example of frugality, constancy, fortitude, and fidelity.⁷⁸ The writings especially of Cicero, Horace, and the younger Seneca contain glowing references to him.⁷⁹ In Cicero's *De officiis*, Regulus is cited as the outstanding example of the Roman, who, unmoved by the appearance of expediency, was consistently guided by the dictates of moral rectitude.⁸⁰

The tales of Regulus' tortures caught the imagination of the Church Fathers, who saw in him the forerunner of Christian martyrs. On four occasions⁸¹ Tertullian mentions his fortitude and derives from it a lesson for Christians. In *Ad martyras* Tertullian says that Regulus was crammed into a sort of chest and pierced on all sides by nails driven from without—so many tortures or "crosses" did he experience (*tot cruces sensit*). Seneca, too, had used the word *cruz* in connection with Regulus, apparently with reference to the spike-studded frame or chest by which he was tortured and deprived of sleep.⁸² Tertullian's allusion to Regulus and other famous Romans in the *Apologeticum* is intended as a kind of parody of the tribute paid to these men by Roman writers. Yet here, too, Tertullian is moved by the "crosses" which Regulus suffered over his whole body (*Regulus . . . toto corpore cruces patitur: o virum fortem et in captivitate victorem!*). In *Ad nationes* Tertullian even suggests that he was the first to

⁷⁵ Val. Max. i. 1. 14; iv. 4. 6; Cic. *Off.* i. 13. 39; Quint. *Inst.* xii. 2. 30.

⁷⁶ See Cic. *Fin.* ii. 20. 65, v. 27. 82; Nat. *deor.* iii. 32. 80; Cat. *M.* 20. 75; *Parad.* 2. 16; *In Pis.* 19. 43; Hor. *Carm.* i. 12. 37, iii. 5; Sen. *Epist.* 67. 7, 12; 98. 12; *Prov.* 3. 4, 9; *Tranq.* 16. 4; *Cons. Helv.* 10. 7.

⁷⁷ Cic. *Off.* iii. 26. 99–32. 115.

⁷⁸ Tert. *Mart.* 4; *Apol.* 50; *Ad nat.* i. 18; *De test. anim.* 4.

⁷⁹ Sen. *Epist.* 98. 12: "Singula vicere iam multi: ignem Mucius, crucem Regulus." Cf. *Prov.* 3. 9: "Figunt cutem clavi et quocumque fatigatum corpus reclinauit, vulneri incumbit, in perpetuum vigiliam suspensa sunt lumina." See also *Tranq.* 16. 4; *Epist.* 67. 7.

⁷⁵ Cf. Sen. *Epist.* 24. 5, 66. 51, 98. 12; *Prov.* iii. 4; *Benef.* iv. 27. 2, vii. 15. 2.

⁷⁶ Min. Felix 37; Tert. *Mart.* 4; Lact. *Inst.* v. 13. 13.

⁷⁷ Mart. viii. 30; x. 25.

"dedicate the innovation of the cross" (*crucis vero novitatem . . . Regulus vester libenter dedicavit*).

Augustine is the warmest admirer of Regulus. He says that, among all the praiseworthy and virtuous citizens of whom the Romans can boast, none is better than Regulus, "who was neither corrupted by good fortune, for he remained very poor in spite of his great success, nor broken by adversity, since he returned undaunted to the most wretched death."⁸³ Augustine upheld the orthodox Christian doctrine that even those Romans who were particularly noted for moral excellence cannot be said to possess true virtue and that "every deed that is done without faith is in error."⁸⁴ Yet on one occasion, at least, Augustine relaxes his rigorous stand and declares that, even though Regulus was without benefit of the faith and of the lessons from Holy Writ, of his own accord he faced inevitable tortures and a death of horrible cruelty lest he be guilty of perjury.⁸⁵

Augustine skilfully turned the sterling qualities of Regulus to the advantage of Christian doctrine. Christians were made to shrink from suicide by deploring the example of Cato and emulating that of Regulus. "If the bravest and most famous men, defenders of an earthly kingdom and of false gods, . . . when conquered chose servitude rather than suicide, how much more will the Christians, worshipers of the true God and aspirants to the heavenly kingdom, refrain from this deed!"⁸⁶

In *De civitate dei* i. 15, Augustine tells the story of Regulus in considerable detail and pays tribute to his courage, which rose superior to his great misfortunes. He

refers to the fate of the Roman general in order to help prove his thesis that the current calamities suffered by Rome are not the result of the failure of the Christians to worship the pagan gods. The apologist shows by the example of Regulus that the gods of Rome do not secure happiness on earth even for their most faithful worshipers.

Augustine considers that it is impossible to reconcile the evils endured by good men like Regulus with faith in the benevolence of the Roman gods. "If these gods have any power at all over good and evil, why did they aid Marius, the worst of men, and forsake Regulus, the best? Is it not because the pagan gods are most unjust and evil?"⁸⁷ Elsewhere Augustine adds: "The unexpected captivity of Regulus and his disgraceful servitude, his fidelity to his oath, and his extremely painful death would compel the Roman gods to blush if they were not bloodless and made of bronze!"⁸⁸

Such, then, was the authority attached to the name of Regulus that he could help in stirring the Christians to suffer martyrdom or could deter them from suicide. By references to him, Augustine tries to shatter the prestige of pagan gods and to absolve the Christians from blame for the fall of Rome.

On the whole, it seems that the Church Fathers find more to commend than to censure in Roman standards of fortitude. Considerations of patriotism and statesmanship, so important to the ancients, have little to do with the fortitude of the Christians, whose thoughts are turned

⁸⁷ *Ibid.* ii. 23. Cf. Cic. *Fin.* v. 27. 82-83; *Tusc.* i. 35. 85-86, 86; *Parad.* 2; Sen. *Benef.* v. 16 ff. Augustine is seeking the same means for measuring and comparing human happiness as Cicero and Seneca had employed. These writers often referred to the fate especially of Regulus, Marius, or Metellus in an effort to define happiness and to account for the reversal of fortune which overtakes good men and evil.

⁸⁸ *Aug. Civ. dei* iii. 18.

⁸³ *Aug. Civ. dei* i. 24.

⁸⁴ *Rom.* 14:23; *Aug. Contra Iulian. Pelag.* iv. 25-27; cf. also *De nupt. et concup.* i. 4.

⁸⁵ *Aug. Epist.* 125. 6.

⁸⁶ *Aug. Civ. dei* i. 24.

rather to the heavenly city. Nevertheless, the apologists freely appropriate both the precepts and the examples of Roman writers. The fortitude required for the good of the earthly city Rome is summoned, with the same *exempla*, for the good of the City of God.

The passages quoted above illustrate the new and wider horizons which Christian apology opened for pagan examples of virtue. The use of extended arguments based on Roman examples not only illumines rhetorical tradition but also clearly indicates one of the enlargements which the Latin Fathers made upon Greek apology. The vigor which the Latin apologists breathed into themes that had become

stereotyped in the schools of rhetoric is easily apparent. Some of these *exempla* are denied a right to fame, while others, many of them women, are exalted to new heights of glory. Such familiar examples as Mucius Scaevola, Curtius, the Decii, and Regulus are used in patristic literature to support doctrines often quite unknown to the ancient Romans. They also reveal the fertility and complexity of Christian argument. Pagan examples, whose renown as models of fortitude is almost as old as Latin literature itself, are the commonplaces of a new dialectic. With their help we can trace one of the channels by which pagan learning was converted into Christian tradition.

WELLESLEY COLLEGE

PROPERTIUS AND HORACE

FRIEDRICH SOLMSEN

IT is well known that in Propertius' third book the love theme occupies a much smaller place than it does in the first and second books. The first poem that actually treats of his love and his *puella* is iii. 6. In the preceding five poems (which for our purposes may be regarded as a unit)¹ Propertius is concerned not so much with his love as with his status as poet of love. Poem iii. 1 was clearly written as a poem to the new collection, although iii. 3 could serve this purpose equally well and was perhaps at one time destined for the place at the opening of this book.² In both these elegies the poet is preoccupied with his standing and fame as the great Roman poet of love and is anxious to make clear that *amor*, not *bella* or Roman history, is his subject. The same may be said of iii. 2. All these elegies, especially iii. 1 and iii. 3, contrast sharply with the opening poem of the first book, in which Propertius speaks of himself entirely as lover, describes love as his fate and disease, and gives no thought as yet to his standing as poet. The opening poem of the second book clearly occupies in this respect an intermediate position between i. 1 and iii. 1 (for which we might again substitute iii. 3), doing justice to the spe-

cific character of Propertius' poetry as well as to his personal fate. The division of this elegy into two, which some scholars have advocated,³ would, of course, destroy precisely this unique character of the poem and would eliminate the connection between his experience and his art which Propertius is anxious to bring out. I must reserve a consideration of this very interesting poem for another occasion and return to the poems which Propertius placed at the beginning of Book iii.

Precisely because Propertius in this book is less concerned with his love and more with his status as the poet of love, he is at pains to elaborate this status and to differentiate his *βίος* from other forms of life. It was probably from a desire to broaden the basis of this *βίος* that Propertius incorporated in these poems certain motifs in which he normally is not much interested, e.g., that he has no wealth, no large farms, and that he has no desire for them.⁴ Now, whatever reasons may account for Propertius' taking up new subjects in Book iii, it is evident that one factor that must be taken into account if we are properly to understand the group iii. 1-5 is the publication of the first three books of Horace's *Odes*, which had taken place between the publication of Propertius' second and third books. It is under

¹ We are justified in including iii. 4 in this group, since this poem, which begins *Arma deus Caesar diles meditatur ad Indos*, is followed by iii. 5: *Pacis Amor deus est, pacem veneramus amantes*. By this arrangement Propertius reinforces the point which he has again and again made (iii. 1. 15 ff., 3. 15 ff., 39 ff.). Poem iii. 2 begins for me with *Orphea detinuisse feras et concita dicunt*, not with *Carminis interea nostri redeamus in orbem*.

² The poet's dream and initiation are motifs which have their traditional place in the poem of an epic or in the *πρόλογος* of a collection of elegies (like Callimachus' *Aetia*). For a careful study of the history of these motifs and of Propertius' innovations see Erich Reitzenstein in *Festschrift für Richard Reitzenstein* (Leipzig, 1931), pp. 52 ff.

³ The second part (beginning at vs. 47, where, according to O. Ribbeck and others, a new elegy opens) has, in fact, much in common with i. 1 if allowance is made for the different style of Book ii, as well as for the fact that in this book Propertius heightens the tragic quality of his erotic experiences by frequent references to his death. Although a foreshadowing of the *funus* motif—the idea that his unhappy love will cause his death—may be found in i. 6. 25, it is, on the whole, characteristic of, and confined to, ii (i. 47, 51 ff., 55 f., 4. 17-24, 8. 17 ff., 9. 37 ff., 13. 18 ff., 17. 13 f.).

⁴ 2. 9 ff., 5. 3 ff.

the influence of Horace's *Odes* that Propertius speaks in iii. 2 and iii. 5 of his lack of interest in material acquisitions;⁵ of the equalizing function of death, which knows no distinction between rich and poor, noble and humble;⁶ of the general futility of human efforts;⁷ and also—though this perhaps is uncertain—of Prometheus' fatal mistake in fashioning man's mind.⁸

Yet, of all the poems included in Horace's three books, none seems to have exerted a greater fascination upon Propertius than the last of the whole collection, "Exegi monumentum"; for this poem furnished him with a number of most impressive symbols for the idea which he is now particularly anxious to formulate—the immortality of his fame as a poet.⁹ In Book i his literary ambition had found a restrained expression, in Book ii he had spoken with considerably greater confidence.¹⁰ Since the publication of Book ii his renown had probably much increased, and his pride had grown correspondingly. In Book iii we find him casting about for new subjects and new forms, yet at the same time most anxious to consolidate and, if possible, to enhance the reputation

which Books i and ii had brought him. Thus he would seize eagerly upon the new forms which Horace had found to proclaim his poetic achievements.

In iii. 2. 15 (17) ff.—

fortunata meo si qua es celebrata libello.
carmina erunt formae tot monumenta tuae.
nam neque Pyramidum sumptus ad sidera ducti
nec Iovis Elei caelum imitata domus
nec Mausolei dives fortuna sepulchri
mortis ab extrema condicione vacat—

we easily recognize echoes of Horace's iii. 30. 1 f. Propertius concentrates not on Horace's *altius* but on his *perennius*; he detaches this concept from the *aes* (in Horace's *aere perennius*) and applies it very properly—but unlike Horace—to the architectural *monumenta*.¹¹ To the one *monumentum* of this kind which he found in Horace he adds two others—a procedure quite in keeping with his poetic habit of piling up illustrations. Verse 20 shows no borrowing, but verses 21 f.—

aut illis flamma aut imber subducat honores
annorum aut icu pondera victa ruent—

are clearly a recasting of Horace's words.¹² It is fair to recognize that one of Horace's ideas—the superiority of literary *monumenta* over the great works of architecture—is given an even more vigorous expression and is, indeed, brought out more clearly (other motifs having been discarded).¹³ The final couplet, too—

at non ingenio quaesitum nomen ab aevo
excidet: ingenio stat sine morte decus—

¹¹ Note the word *monumenta* in vs. 28, which prepares the ground for the reference to the pyramids and other buildings. The word as such has, however, no connotations of 'monumentality' (Catullus 95. 9 speaks of the *parva monumenta* of a fellow-poet).

¹² iii. 30. 3–5.

¹³ Horace's *altius* is perhaps not completely discarded but has been given a subordinate place (*sumptus ad sidera ducti*, vs. 17; *caelum imitata domus*, vs. 18).

⁵ 2. 9 ff. (cf. esp. *Carm.* ii. 18. 1 ff.), 5. 2–5.

⁶ iii. 5. 13–18 (cf. Hor. i. 4. 13 ff.; ii. 3. 21 ff., 14. 9 ff., 18. 32 ff.; iii. 1. 13 ff.). Propertius' *pariter* corresponds to Horace's *aequum* (*aequo pede*, i. 4. 13; *aequa lege*, iii. 1. 13; *aequa tellus*, ii. 18. 32). Propertius is successful in finding new illustrations for the idea; vs. 15 f. have earned him the special praise of W. Y. Sellar (*Horace and the Elegiac Poets* [Oxford, 1899], pp. 310, 316).

⁷ 5. 11 f.

⁸ Max Rothstein in his commentary (*Die Elegien des Sextus Propertius* [2d ed.; Berlin, 1920]) compares Hor. i. 16. 13 ff. with Prop. iii. 5. 6. Propertius has preserved no trace of Horace's subtle irony.

⁹ The relevant passages are put together by H. E. Butler and E. A. Barber, *The Elegies of Propertius* (Oxford, 1933), p. xxiv. The authors speak in this connection of Propertius' "plagiarisms," a term which perhaps does more justice to Horace's feelings than to Propertius' achievements (cf. *ibid.*, p. lxxv: "Elegies I–III [of Book III] conflate Callimachus with Horace").

¹⁰ i. 7. 10 ff., 21 ff.; ii. 5. 27 ff., 13. 37 ff., 34. 93 ff.

gives the Horatian claim a new and original turn. We may remember that Propertius had always been proud of his *ingenium*.¹⁴

In theme and thought iii. 2 has much in common with iii. 1; and, in view of the borrowings that are found in iii. 2, we shall the more readily recognize a similar indebtedness to Horace in iii. 1. There is every probability that it was Horace's proud claim *primus Aeolium carmen*, etc., which inspired Propertius' equally proud statement of his literary accomplishments in iii. 1. 3 f.¹⁵ No less interesting from our point of view are the two couplets:

Famae post obitum fingit maiora vetustas:
maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit [vss.
23 f.].

and

nec non ille tui casus memorator Homerus
posteritate suum crescere sensit opus [vss.
33 f.].

If nothing else in this poem and other related poems recalled Horace's *Odes* iii. 30, one might hesitate to assert that these lines reflect his *non omnis moriar multaque pars mei vitabit Libitinam*; as things are, it is probable that Propertius had Horace's lines in mind; in particular, the words *posteritate suum crescere sensit opus* are obviously influenced by Horace's *usque ego postera crescam laude*.

It should be noticed that the two couplets of which we are speaking are in a

¹⁴ Even when he recognized (what he now no longer seems inclined to do) *ingenium nobis ipsa puella facit* (ll. 1. 4; cf. ll. 30. 40 and 34. 58; see also lv. 1. 126).

¹⁵ More precisely, after Vergil (*Ecl.* 6. 1 ff., *Georg.* iii. 10 f., a passage which may have left some marks on our poem) as well as Horace (ll. 30. 13) had formulated what each had done as *primus* or *princeps*, Propertius felt impelled to come forward with a corresponding statement of what he had been *primus* to achieve (cf. Wilhelm Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur* [Stuttgart, 1924], pp. 12 ff.; see also Rothstein's commentary *ad loc.*; vs. 4 is, however, as obscure as it is beautiful; at least I cannot see that it has been convincingly explained).

sense continuous, that is, verses 33 f. take up and carry on the thought of verses 23 f. What Propertius placed between them—*nam quis equo pulsas abiegnos nosceret arces* etc.—is his version of a Greek *τόπος* which we know in its Hellenistic version from Theocritus¹⁶ but which Propertius himself may just as easily have known from another, though presumably also Hellenistic, source. The idea is that heroic achievements like those recorded in the *Iliad* would be forgotten if they did not live on in the works of the great poets. Propertius saw fit to graft this *τόπος* (which he, of course, remolded in accordance with his own poetic style) upon the Horatian idea of the poet's own fame which continues to grow among posterity. However, the Greek *τόπος* and Horace's idea do not signify exactly the same thing; the one stresses the eternal fame of the subject treated by the poet, the other that of the poet himself. In fact, it is clear that Propertius, having spoken of the subject matter of the *Iliad*, wrote the couplet 33 f. (quoted above) to bring in the poet himself, *Homerus*, who *posteritate suum crescere sensit opus*. Having done this, he can wind up by asserting *meque inter seros laudabit Roma nepotes*.

It may well be said that Propertius carried the idea of the poet's immortality a stage beyond Horace. To combine the Greek idea of the immortal fame of the subject matter embodied in a great poem with the Roman motif, i.e., the author's claim of his own immortality,¹⁷ was per-

¹⁶ ll. 48 ff.

¹⁷ The thought as such is, of course, familiar to the Greeks, too, and, in fact, is of Greek origin (see esp. Plato, *Symp.* 209c and d. Yet we know of no Greek models for Horace's *Ezegi monumentum*. In iii. 2 Propertius combines with the motif of Horace iii. 30 certain Greek stock exempla of "the power of song" and some observations about his own *flor*. The phrasing of these observations shows that they have been inspired by Horace's *Non ebur neque aureum* (ll. 18; see above, p. 106). The result is again a genuine

fectly legitimate, and the result is a noble and highly poetic train of thought, which Propertius' contemporaries as well as posteritas could justly admire. Propertius' technique is the same as we find in other poems of his which deal with comparable subjects;¹⁸ he puts before our eyes in poetic language a number of significant episodes of the Trojan War. The couplet 29 f., which at first seems to be only an array of glittering names, yet at the end brings a new turn of thought in the words *vix sua nosset humus*. And the last couplet of this sequence reaffirms the point made at the beginning (*exiguo sermone fores... quis nosceret*)—it would be pedantic to hold against the poet that he has made a distinction between *Ilion* and *Troia*.

I have said that Propertius was successful in attempting a new development of the Horatian idea, and yet Nemesis caught up with him, even though *pede claudo*. It was his bad luck that Horace himself was, in the fourth book of his *Odes*, to deal with the same poetic ideas and that he was to present his own version also of the Greek *τόπος* with which Propertius had embroidered the thought of *Ode* iii. 30. That he should do so in Book iv seems natural enough if we consider how much he, too, is preoccupied in this book with his status as poet and how much the Pindaric triad of ideas, *ἀρετή, κλέος, αἰδώς*, meant to him at that time.¹⁹ It was left to Horace to give the Greek *τόπος*, which

Propertius, perhaps as *princeps*, had incorporated in Roman poetry, its classical form; it is his words, especially his *vixere fortes ante Agamemnona*, which have come to mind in the past whenever an authoritative statement of the idea was needed.

In the first stanza of iv. 9 Horace reaffirms what he has said in iii. 30 about the immortality of his poetic work (compare especially *quae longe sonantem natus ad Aufidum... with dicar qua violens obstrepit Aufidus...*).²⁰ His own immortality Horace this time does not explicitly assert. Not that the poet is completely merged in his work—how could we fail to perceive the significance of the first person in *verba loquor socianda chordis*—but no special point is made of this personal fame. Horace is proud of his work, but with the expression of this pride he combines—what Propertius would not or could not do—an unqualified recognition of the superiority of Homer.²¹ The lyric poets of the Greeks (in whose footsteps Horace has followed)²² are immortal; their work has remained alive even though *priores Maeonius tenet sedes Homerus*. Propertius had put himself directly beside Homer.

Moreover, when Horace comes to deal with the subjects on which Homer has bestowed immortality,²³ he gives the *τόπος* a most strikingly original and brilliant new turn. Instead of saying once more that the Greek and Trojan heroes would have been forgotten if there had been no Homer, he forces our minds to focus on the fact that there were great heroes and great events that have actually been forgotten. Five clauses of inexorable finality repeat with extremely skilful stylistic variations

and convincing expression of Propertius' own feelings. The fact that the motifs of this elegy can be "isolated" and their origin determined helps us to understand the genesis of this poem and the working of Propertius' imagination but has no bearing upon the appraisal of the poetic qualities of the elegy.

¹⁸ See, e.g., ii. 1. 19–24, 27–34; iii. 3. 7–12, 9. 49 ff.

¹⁹ See besides iv. 9, esp. iv. 8 and also iv. 2. 19 ff. "Quem tu Melpomene" (iv. 3) precedes the most Pindaric of Horace's odes (iv. 4) (cf. Hermann Gundert, *Pindar und sein Dichterberuf* [Frankfurt, 1935], pp. 26 ff., 46 ff. and *passim*; see also my paper in *Zeitschrift für Aesthetik*, XXVI [1932], 149 ff., esp. 161 ff.).

²⁰ Cf. iii. 30. 10; iv. 9. 2.

²¹ Verses 5 ff.

²² Cf. Propertius' references to his Greek models, Callimachus and Philotas (iii. 1. 1).

²³ Verses 13–28. Horace includes Helen's falling in love with Paris, although it is not, strictly speaking, a subject of the *Iliad*. Propertius includes the episode of the wooden horse.

the *non solus, non semel, non primus* motif, inculcating in our mind the truth which is finally made explicit in the words *omnes illacrimabiles urgentur ignotique longa nocte carent quia vate sacro*.²⁴ Horace's stanzas breathe a more heroic spirit than Propertius' couplets, and the recurring conceit—*non sola, primusve, non semel*, etc.—gives Horace's poetic diction a degree of structure and a plastic quality which raise it above the level of Propertius'—however cleverly varied—series of episodes.²⁵ The triumph of form is more complete in Horace; it would be so even without the careful alternation between Greek and Trojan illustrations²⁶ and without the deliberate brevity of the three middle clauses, which contrast with the longer sentences at the beginning and the end of the thought.

Horace's ode includes no turn of phrase

²⁴ Professor Hutton refers me to Lucr. v. 324 ff., where the opposite point is made. One may wonder whether Horace deliberately flies in the face of an Epicurean tenet.

²⁵ The aesthetic judgment regarding the passage in Propertius is made somewhat difficult by the fact that the end of vs. 27 is uncertain. Of the manuscripts, N has only *Idaeum Simoenta Jovis*. The other class of manuscripts (FLP) continues *cunabula parvi*, which is unsatisfactory. Butler and Barber, like other editors before them, accept G. Wolff's *cum prole Scamandri*. This suggestion would be attractive if there were other instances in which Propertius uses a hexameter to develop the *exemplum* given in the pentameter of the preceding couplet.

²⁶ Some of these stylistic features are pointed out by Heinze in his commentary on lv. 9 (Adolf Kiessling and Richard Heinze, *Horas: Oden und Epoden* [7th ed.; Berlin, 1930]).

that reminds us of Propertius;²⁷ from the wording of this poem it would be impossible to decide whether Horace was acquainted with the first elegy of Propertius' third book. And yet, what person familiar with the conditions of literary life at the time could doubt that Horace knew the poems which Propertius had placed at the opening of this book and in which he had invaded Horace's own domain and tried to improve upon his poetic conceptions by adding a reference to Homer and incorporating the Greek *τόπος*. These poems were a challenge to the *πατήρ τοῦ λόγου*; yet it is in keeping with the tone and attitude of Horace's fourth book that, although cognizant of what Propertius had done with his motifs and himself incorporating the same *τόπος* (as well as a reference to Homer), Horace steers clear of anything that could be regarded as a verbal echo or indebtedness. With soaring wing, he rises above Propertius' experiment. The fact (if it is a fact) that Horace lacked personal affection for Propertius²⁸ need not even have anything to do with this attitude.

CORNELL UNIVERSITY

²⁷ We may disregard the fact that Hector and Delphobus, who illustrate Trojan bravery in Horace (vs. 22), appear also in Propertius' list of Trojan heroes (vss. 28 f.).

²⁸ This inference is commonly and probably correctly drawn from *Epist.* II. 2. 99 ff. (see the most recent discussion by Brooks Otis, *TAPA*, LXXVI [1945], 188 ff.).

THE INDIANA UNIVERSITY PAPYRI

VERNE B. SCHUMAN

SMALL collections of papyri rarely contain much that is new. They are of value as supplementary material, adding a little to the great mass of texts that deal with all phases of the life of Greco-Roman Egypt. No claims beyond this are made for the Indiana group. However, every care has been taken to present accurate texts, a very difficult task in some cases because of the poor condition of the papyrus.

With the exception of No. 7, obtained from the late Ralph Van Deman Magoffin, they were purchased by the editor in Egypt in 1929 for the Latin Department of Indiana University. Their provenance, except when indicated by internal evidence, is unknown.

In addition to the ten texts presented here, there are, as is always the case, a number of smaller fragments that have been considered of too little consequence for publication; also one Coptic document and several Arabic pieces. No study has yet been made of these latter pieces.

1. CONTRACT

OXYRHYNCHUS 8.3 × 3.3 CM. 73 B.C.(?)

Too little of this contract remains to determine its nature. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it was most certainly written by the same scribe who wrote *P Oxy.*, 1628 (73 B.C.), which is reproduced in full size as Plate I in Volume XIV of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. The first two lines of the Indiana fragment can be superimposed

upon the corresponding section of the plate with all letters of both texts coinciding. Beyond this point the length of lines in the two documents differs. In two other respects both papyri are similar: both were written in the month Apellaios, and both mention the ἀγυῖα Κλεοπάτρας Ἀφροδίτης. The identity of the hands, together with the fact that both contracts were written in the same month, allows the date 73 B.C. to be assigned to the present document with a fair degree of certainty. All restorations in lines 1-5 are based on *P Oxy.*, 1628.

βασιλευόντων Πτολεμαίου καὶ [Κλεοπάτρας τῆς καὶ
Τρυφαινῆς θεῶν Φιλοπατόρω[ν Φιλαδέλφω
ἔτους θ τὰ δ'] ἄλλα τῶν κοινῶν[ὡς ἐν
'Ἀλεξανδρ-
εῖαι γράφ]εται, μηνὸς Ἀπελλα[ίου καὶ
Φαῶφι.

5. ἐν Ὁξυρύχ[ω]ν πόλει τῆς Θηβ[αίδος

.....
±9]εῖ Πλουτα[±18
±5 τῆς ἐ]πιγονῆς Ξε[±15
±7]οῖ τῶν κατοικω[ν ἰππέων
ἀγυῖας

Κλεοπάτ[ρας Ἀφροδίτης. [±13

10. ±13]τον περ[±13
±10 τα]λάντων τέσ[σαρα ±8
±13 τ]ου Ξε[ρο ±13
±15]ν Ξε[ρο[±13
±14 β]εβαιω[σ ±12

3. ἔτους θ: The ninth year is restored here from *P Oxy.*, 1628 for the reason stated in the introduction.
6. Πλουτα[may be restored as Πλοῦταρχος, since this name occurs with some frequency in other papyri from Oxyrhynchus. See Preisigke, *Namenbuch*, for this name and others with a similar beginning. 8. τῶν

κατοίκων ἐκπῶν: Cf. *P Oxy.*, 1628. 6. 8-9. ἀγούσ | Κλεο-
νάρ]pas 'Αφροδίτης: Cf. *P Oxy.* 1628. 8 and note. 14.
βρεβαίως may be restored as either noun or verb.

2. CONTRACT OF SALE

THEADELPHIA 12 × 7.2 CM. A.D. 138

An agreement for the sale of a young animal, probably a camel or donkey, the word designating the animal being in lacuna, although the price is somewhat out of line for both. This contract is unusual, in that the price is stated in drachmas of copper. The papyrus is badly wormeaten throughout.

Ἔτους δευτέρ[ο]ν Αὐτ[ο]κρά[τ]α(τορος)
Καίσαρος

Τίτου Αἰλίου Ἀδριανοῦ Ἀντωνίνου
Σεβαστοῦ Εὐσεβοῦς [μηνὸς] Φαῶ(φι)
δευτέρα ἐν Θεαδελφείᾳ τ[ῆς] Θε[μ]ί-
[το]ν

5. μερίδος τοῦ Ἀ[ρ]σινόιτ(ου) νο[μ]οῦ.
δ]μο-

λογοῦσιν Πτολεμαῖος . . . ὥς ἐτ[ῶ]ν
τεσσαράκοντα ἐπτά ἄ[σ]ημος]—

καὶ ἡ τοῦτου γυνὴ Θαυβᾶς—

Φιλήμωνος ὥς ἐτ[ῶ]ν τεσσαρά—

10. κοντα ἐπτά οὐλὴ μετώπῳ—

μέσω μετὰ νιοῦ αὐτοῦ Πεσάι(ος)

'Αφροδισίῳ Φιλίππου Ἀντι—

νοεῖ ὥς ἐτ[ῶ]ν τεσσα[ρά]κοντα

οὐ[λ]ή [± 12

15. πεπρακέναι αὐτ[ῶ]ν κάμηλον

πῶλον ἄβολον λευκ[ό]χρουν

τοῦτ[ο]ν τοι[οῦ]τον ἀναπα[ό]ριφ[ον] καὶ

ἀπέχιν τοὺς [δ]μολογούντας

παρὰ τοῦ Ἀφροδισίου τὴν συν—

20. πε[φ]ωνημένην πρὸς ἀλλή—

λους τιμὴν χαλκοῦ δραχμὰς

τριακοσία[s] ἐξήκοντα τέσσαρας

παραχρη[σ]μα διὰ χ[ειρ]δὸς ἐξ οἴκ[ου]

οἱ [± 15

6. Πτολεμαῖος: This restoration is purely con-
jectural. 15. κάμηλον: This restoration suits per-
fectly the length of the line and for that reason is a
better one than δον. The price in this instance suits

each animal about equally well. A listing of the prices paid for camels and donkeys as recorded in various documents is to be found in A. C. Johnson, *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome: Roman Egypt* (Baltimore, 1936), pp. 230-31; and Angelo Segrè, *Circolazione monetaria e prezzi nel mondo antico ed in particolare in Egitto* (Rome, 1922), pp. 126-29. 21. χαλκοῦ: As far as I can determine, this is the only instance in the sale of a donkey or camel when the price is stated in drachmas of copper. Usually the price is given in drachmas of silver, although occasionally there is no indication of the type of money.

TRANSLATION

The second year of the Emperor Caesar Titus Aelius Hadrian Antoninus Augustus Pius, the second day of the month Phaophi, in Theadelphia of the division of Themistes of the Arsinoite nome. Ptolemaios . . . about forty-seven years old, without any mark of identification, and his wife Thaumas, daughter of Philemon, about forty-seven years old, with a scar in the middle of her forehead, together with his son Pesais, acknowledge to Aphrodisios, son of Philippos, of Antinoe, about forty years old, with a scar . . . that they have sold to him a white camel foal that has not shed its first teeth, just as it is, irrevocably, and that they, the parties of the first part, have received from Aphrodisios the price agreed upon among themselves, 364 drachmas of copper in cash, from hand to hand out of his house. . . .

3. CONTRACT FOR SERVICE

9.5 × 4 CM. LATE III

Despite the smallness of the fragment, sufficient text remains to allow the nature of the document to be determined with some degree of certainty. Key words and phrases (ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔτη, l. 5; τ[έ]χνην, l. 7; ἀφήμερον, l. 9; ἰμ[α]τιζόμενον, l. 10; παρέστη[ι], l. 11; and παρ[α]μέναι, l. 12) indicate a

contract for service similar to those found in *BGU*, IV, 1126; *P Tebt.*, 384; and *P Mich.*, 355. In the present document it appears that a certain Soterichos contracts to furnish his ward for a specified period of time to an individual whose complete name is not preserved but who may well be a weaver. Probably, since this is the case in the other contracts mentioned, the labor provided is in lieu of payment of interest on a loan.

- Σ]ωτήριχος Π[
 ± 14]τω τῷ κ[αί] 'Ισι[χαίρειν
 ὁμολογῶ παρέξ[ε]σθαι τὸν φροντ[ιζό-
 μενον ± 10
 ± 14]Σωσικόσμειο[ν ± 17
 5. ± 14]ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔτη[. ἀπὸ τοῦ
 ἐνεστῶτος
 . ἔτους ± 9 Κ]αίσαρος τοῦ [κυρίου
 ἐργαζόμενον
 κατὰ τὴν γεωδίακην τ[έ]χνην ἔτι δ[έ]
 ± 16
 ± 12 παντ[α]χῇ κατ' ἐγ[γ]υ[ν]
 ± 16
 . . . ἀπόκοιτον μηδ[έ] ἀφήμερον[± 19
 10. ± 13 ἱμ]ατισόμεν[ον ± 18
 ± 11 αὐτὸ]ν παρέξ[ε]τ[αι] ± 18
 ± 12 παρ]αμέναι δ[± 21
 ± 15]Σωτηρίχῳ[± 20

3. ὁμολογῶ παρέξ[ε]σθαι: Cf. *P Mich.*, 355. 1. τὸν φροντ[ιζόμενον]: Followed perhaps by ἐν' ἐμοῦ. 5. ἐπὶ χρόνον ἔτη: Cf. *BGU*, IV, 1126. 8; *P Mich.*, 355. 2. Following ἔτη[. the restoration might either include or omit the name of a month (cf. *BGU*, IV, 1126. 8 and *P Tebt.*, 384. 3. 6-7. ἐργαζόμενον κατὰ τὴν γεωδίακην τ[έ]χνην: Cf. *P Tebt.*, 384. 4. Since weaving is the craft most frequently mentioned, γεωδίακην is probably, though not necessarily, correct. 8. παντ[α]χῇ κατ' ἐγ[γ]υ[ν]: This restoration is questionable, but compare *P Mich.*, 355. 11, κατὰ τὸν νόμον πανταχῇ. 9. ἀπόκοιτον μηδ[έ] ἀφήμερον: Cf. *BGU*, IV, 1126. 11-12; *P Tebt.*, 384. 6. 10. ἱμ]ατισόμεν[ον]: Cf. *P Oxy.*, 275. 14; *BGU*, IV, 1126. 22. 11. παρ]εξ[ε]τ[αι] for παρ[ι]εξ[ε]ται. Cf. *P Oxy.*, 275. 26. 12. παρ]αμέναι for παραμέναι. Cf. *BGU*, IV, 1126. 9.

4. DAILY EXPENSE ACCOUNT

9 × 3.5 cm. III?

Account with day-by-day entries, principally of foodstuffs. Written on

the verso in a heavy bookhand. Parts of eight lines, written by a different hand, on the recto, but insufficient to give an intelligible text. Similar accounts are to be found in *P Oxy.*, 736 and 739.

- μολοχ[ίου
 ὕδροφ[όρων
 Γ' τῆς ἡμέρας
 σέυτλου
 5. ζύτου
 γάρου
 πράσων
 Γ' τῆς ἡμέρας
 μολοχίου
 10. ζύτου
 ὄξους
 ὕδροφόρω[ν
 Γ' τῆς ἡμέρας
 σέυτλου
 15. κουρί(ου) ἑμοί
 ζύτου
 Γ[τῆς] ἡ[μέρας]

1. μολοχ[ίου]: Cf. 1. 9. The word is not listed in Preislige, *Wörterbuch*. The latest edition of Liddell and Scott equates μολόχιον with μαλάχιον and defines it as "a woman's ornament worn around the neck." Stephanus, *Thesaurus*, gives as the first definition "malva," then "ornamentum muliebre." "Mallow" seems the better interpretation here. 15. κουρί(ου): Probably for κορί(ου), "coriander seed."

5. PAYMENTS OF GRAIN

9 × 6.9 cm. EARLY III

Record of payments of grain, written in a small, cursive hand. A similar account may be found in *P Amherst*, 129.

- Ἡρων Φροντ () (ἀρτάβας)β . . .
 Πρωτᾶς Π[.]ρα () (ἀρτάβας)β
 Ζωιλᾶς [.]νηλ () (ἀρτάβας)β
 5. Πάτρων Πεήτε(ως) (ἀρτάβας)β
 Ἀφροδιτ[] (ἀρτάβας)β
 Λάχητος (ἀρτάβας)β
 (γίνονται) (ἀρτάβαι) ιβ (ἡμισυ)

1. This line begins farther to the left than those following and was probably not a regular entry. 2. β . . .

Following β in a very cursive style are perhaps three letters which most nearly resemble $\kappa\epsilon\tau$ or $\kappa\alpha\tau$, with the τ standing above the line to indicate an abbreviation. Their meaning is not apparent. Though the total includes one-half artab, I cannot read $\eta\mu(\sigma\upsilon)$. Furthermore, the use of an abbreviation at this point but a symbol in l. 8 would be strange. 6. The restoration should perhaps be ($\delta\sigma\tau\acute{\alpha}\theta\alpha\varsigma$) β ($\eta\mu\sigma\upsilon$), since l. 1 does not appear to have been a regular entry.

6. RECEIPT FOR WORK ON A CANAL

TEBTUNIS 9.8 \times 4.4 CM. A.D. 51

Receipt issued to Heracles, son of Phaeus, of Tebtunis, for five days' work on a canal completed before Mesore 30 (August 23).

($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) ια Τιβερίου Κλαυδίου Καίσαρ[ο]ς
Σεβαστοῦ [Γερμανικοῦ
Αὐτοκράτορος. ἕως Μεσορῆ λ' ἐν τ(ῇ) δι(ώρυ-
γι) Κερκ() ἥρ[γ(ά)σατο] τὴν πενθ(ήμε-
ρον)

Ἡρακλῆς Φαεῦτος ἀπὸ Τεβτ(ύνεως).

[Second hand] Θεμίσιων σεσημείωμαι

2. $\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$: A fiber of the papyrus has been torn away, destroying the top of each letter of $\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$. Despite this mutilation, the reading seems certain and represents a slight difference from the other extant receipts. It may indicate that work on canals was not necessarily done on five consecutive days. Κερκ(): Probably to be resolved Κερκ(εοστρεως) or Κερκ(εοστῶων Ὀρου) (see P Tebt., II, pp. 383-84). ἥρ[γ(ά)σατο] τὴν πενθ(ήμερον): Cf. P Lond., 165.

TRANSLATION

The eleventh year of Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus Emperor. Up to Mesore 30, Heracles, son of Phaeus, from Tebtunis, has worked five days on the canal of Kerk().

Signed by me, THEMISON.

7. TAX RECEIPT

PHILADELPHIA 17.6 \times 11.2 CM. A.D. 302

Receipt for payment of a tax the nature of which I have been unable to determine because of the condition of the papyrus and the extremely cursive character of the writing. Written on

the verso in the upper fourth of the sheet.

ιη ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) καὶ ιζ' ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) καὶ ι ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$)

Παχὼν η—

διέγρ(αψε) Κοῦλω(ς) ἀρχ()εας διὰ
τοῦ καταλογιστοῦ

καμὸν ιη ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) καὶ ιζ' ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) καὶ ι
($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) κώμης Φιλαδε(λφείας)

(δραχμὰς)

διακοσίας τεσσεράκοντα (γίνονται)
(δραχμαὶ) σμ—

5. . . .]χαζ . . δεκ() εξ() [Second hand]

Διρῆλ(ιος) Ἡρακλῆς

δε[κᾶ]πρω(τος) σεση(μείωμαι)

1. ιη ($\epsilon\tau\circ\upsilon\varsigma$) καὶ ιζ' are the regnal years of Diocletian, Maximian, and Constantius. 2. ἀρχ()εας: The papyrus has $\alpha\rho\chi\epsilon\alpha\varsigma$. The resolution of the abbreviation is puzzling. καταλογιστοῦ: The writing at this point on the papyrus is almost obliterated by blotting and rubbing. 3. κώ(μης): The papyrus has κώ. 5. δεκ() εξ(): κ is written above the line to indicate an abbreviation; above εξ is a line which extends over the first three letters of Διρῆλ(ιος) (cf. note on κώ(μης), l. 3).

8. TAX RECORD

10.1 \times 6.3 CM. EARLY II

Written on the verso in a labored, semicursive hand. The papyrus is badly water-stained, and, where the ink is washed, readings are very doubtful. Though the text seems to contain no verb, it apparently is a record for the payment of a tax or taxes¹ in which members of the family of a certain Galates from the *kleros* of Glaukios are twice involved. Since the sum recorded in line 8 is 5 drachmas, one is at once inclined to think of the *πεντάδραχμος*; but the information concerning this tax is too slight to warrant any conclusion.²

¹ Cf. H. C. Youtie, "Family ΣΤΝΤΑΞΙΜΟΝ Records from Karanis," *Aegyptus*, XIII (1933), 569-79.

² See Johnson, *Roman Egypt* (Baltimore, 1936), p. 518; Wallace, *Taxation in Egypt* (Princeton, 1938), pp. 65-66.

The earliest date mentioned is the eighteenth year of Tiberius (l. 1). The eighth year of Vespasian occurs in line 6, and a fifteenth year in line 9. This cannot refer to Vespasian, since his reign was not so long, but may refer to the first emperor following him, to whom a fifteenth year can be assigned, i.e., Trajan.

τῇ ἕως . ων ιη (ἔτους) Τιβερίου
Ἑρμογένη νεω(τέρα) Ἑρμογ(ένου)
μητρ(ός) Ταυ()

δια τῆς αὐτῆς ορουμ . . θι() Ἑρμιό-
νης Γαλάτου τοῦ Ἑράτω(νος) ἐκ τοῦ

5. Γλαυκίου

η (ἔτους) Οὔεσπασιανού Ἑρμιόθι
Γαλάτου τοῦ Ἑράτω(νος) ἐκ τοῦ
αὐ]τοῦ κλήρου (δραχμαὶ) ε

10.] . ου τοῦ ιε (ἔτους) Ἑρμιό-
γένη νεω]τ(έρα) Ἑρμογ(ένου) διὰ
τῆς
αὐτῆς] . . . [

1. τῇ: Perhaps τῇ (ἀριθμοί). ων: Only a spot of ink precedes ω. 3. ορουμ . . θι(): θι is written above the line to indicate an abbreviation. 5. Γλαυκίου: *P Leip.*, 10. I. 22 mentions a Γλαυκίου κλήρος. This document was found at Hermopolis, and the persons drawing it up were from the village of Moerae of the Hermopolite nome. The Γλαυκίου κλήρος, therefore, was probably located in this vicinity. 6. Ἑρμιόθι: θι is written above the line. Pape, *Griechische Eigennamen*, gives "Ἑρμιόθ, Name der Juden in Aegypten," and cites Eusebius *Praep. evangel.* ix. 18. This passage reads: Ἀπράτανος διέφησιν ἐν τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοὺς μὲν Ἰουδαίους ὀνομάζεσθαι Ἑρμιόθ, δ' εἶναι μεθερμηνεύθεν κατὰ τὴν Ἑλλάδα φωνὴν Ἰουδαίους. 8. αὐ]τοῦ κλήρου: i.e., Γλαυκίου. (δραχμαὶ) ε: The papyrus has]-ε. This same amount may have been entered at the end of l. 5, but the writing is all but obliterated there.

9. TAX REGISTER

FRAG. a, 11.1 × 8.3 cm.; FRAG. b, 14.3 × 7
cm. MID. II

Written in the small cursive that is characteristic of the middle of the second century. Upper margin, 1.3 cm.; lower, 1.5 cm. The margin between columns i and ii ranges from 1.6

to 2.6 cm. The amount lost between the two fragments cannot be determined from the recto or the letter (No. 10) written on the verso. Column i contains the ends of lines only, the amounts paid in. No symbol for the drachma occurs, a peculiarity found also in *BGU*, IX, 1891. Among the entries for payment in money is recorded one payment in kind, Frag. b, Col. I, line 7, where an entry of eight artabs of wheat is made. Column ii does not contain any complete lines, though Frag. b does have the beginning and end of lines 4-7.

FRAG. a, COL. I

] . [. . . .
] . ηθ[. . .
] — κη
] α — κη
5.] α — κη
] κε — κη
] . . ζ
] . — η
] ς δ
10.] . . θ = διασ()
] . θ =

FRAG. b, COL. I

] ε = [δι]ασ()
] ερ() η
] . ωρ ε =
] ε =
5.] μη(τρός) Θερ() ε Φρουῶ(νσις) β =
] . κ ε =
] . (πύρου ἀρτάβας) η
] δ
] ρου το(ῦ) δ

FRAG. a, COL. II

Νεῖλος Τρύφωνος το(ῦ) Ἡρωνος μη-
(τρός) Ἰρή[νης

Ἔρωσ δούλ(ος) Παλαῦτος το(ῦ) Ἐρίω-
νος [

Πεκῦσις Ἑρώτος το(ῦ) Ἑρώτος μη-
(τρὸς) Θη[

Φάεις ἀπάτωρ μη(τρὸς) Δημ[α]ρο-
(ῦτος) [

5. Ἑρακλῆς ἀδελφὸς (μητρὸς) τῆς
α(ὑτῆς) [

Νεῖλος Νείλου τοῦ Ἑρώτος μη(τρὸς)
Πτολ[

Ἀ]νουβᾶς Ὀρου το(ῦ) Σοκονέω(νος)
(μητρὸς) Δη. [

Εὐτυχῆς δο[ῦ]λ(ος) Ἀνουβ() τῆς
Ἡ . . ο . [

Νεῖλο[s . . .]ω. το(ῦ) Ὀννώφ(ρεως)
(μητρὸς) . . . [

10.] υἱὸς μη(τρὸς) Τ[. . . .] .
φῆς [

. . . .] . [.] ν . . . το(ῦ) Ἑρωδ . [.] .
εἰριθ[

. . .] ης δούλ(ος) Δημαρο[ῦ]τις τ[ῆς]
. . . .] . . [

FRAG. b, COL. II

.] . . [. .] . [.] . [.] . . [

.] το(ῦ) Α . . . [

. [. . . .] Φαηρίου το(ῦ) . . [

Ἑρω[. . .] σ() το(ῦ) Ἑρακλᾶ
μ[η(τρὸς) . . .] . θ ε=

5. Σαταβοῦς [.] α [.] . . το(ῦ) Σατα-
[β(ούτος) μη(τρὸς)] . [. .] . —η

Ἀνουβᾶς Α . . ο() το(ῦ) Σα . . τω
[. . . .] αη [. .] ε=

Σαλῆς . . . α . . . το(ῦ) . αγ . [. .]
. . . . ε=

Σερ . . ξ Εἰ [

Ἀμμων Α [. . .
. . .] . [

10. Πρωτᾶς Α [. .] . [. .] . [

FRAG. a, COL. I

10. διασ() : There is no indication on the papyrus that this is an abbreviation, though I have so expressed it. The same letters seemingly occur also in Frag. b, Col. i. 1. Their meaning is not apparent.

FRAG. a, COL. II

9. Νεῖλο[s . . .]ω. : perhaps Νεῖλο[s Ὀννώφ(ρεως)].

10. LETTER

FRAG. a, 11.1 × 8.3 CM.; FRAG. b, 14.3 × 7
CM. LATE II—EARLY III

Letter in two fragments, addressed to Arsinoos, who is censured for his failure to keep certain promises. Lack of space caused the writer to use the left margin for the closing line. The amount lost between the two pieces cannot be determined. Written on the verso of No. 9.

FRAG. a

.] μος Ἀρσινόῳ τῷ φιλτάτῳ
χαίρειν.

γί]νωσκε ὅτι

. . .] . . . τοῖς διὰ ἡμᾶς [.] . .

FRAG. b

. ὑπέσ]χου πέμψ[αι
. . . .

τὴν δόσιν αὐτῇν μοι—κα[ὶ οὐκ] ἐπεμψας

κα [κατὰ] ἐν ὀνόμῳ
Χαιρέου. ὑπέσχου πέμψαι

τρεῖς καμήλους [πρ] οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἐποίη-
σας

5. οὖν θερίνᾳ μὴ γενέσθαι ἀμάρτη-
μα

ἔρρωσο. ἐπεμψας ἡν μετὰ ἡμᾶς
. . . αἰὼν ὅπως

FRAG. b

3. [κατὰ . . .] : Written above the line. 4. οὐδὲ :
Corrected from οὐρε. 6. ἔρρωσο : Written above the line,
partly in the margin, partly above ἐπεμψας.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

PHILIP V AND ALCAEUS OF MESSENE

In an important and suggestive article F. W. Walbank has recently re-examined the political epigrams of Alcaeus of Messene and has discussed the attitude of the poet toward King Philip V of Macedonia.¹ Since I shall differ from Walbank on an important point of interpretation, it is fitting that I acknowledge how much I have learned from his study and emphasize my indebtedness to it.

Five epigrams by Alcaeus, whose themes are concerned with the politics of his time, are preserved in the *Anthology*. All of them have to do more or less directly with Philip V; and, of the five, four are obviously and unequivocally hostile to Philip.² On general grounds one might maintain with some plausibility that no Messenian was likely to have remained a supporter of Philip after the unfortunate events of the years 215 and 214 B.C.;³ but a priori considerations cannot safely be used to deduce the (hypothetical) political behavior of an individual Messenian, particularly of a professional literary man. Walbank, following largely the views of Momigliano, holds that down to ca. 201 B.C. Alcaeus, though a Messenian, was a supporter of Philip V, like most of the *bourgeoisie* of the Peloponnesus, and that his break with Philip occurred only sometime between 201 and 197. The development of Alcaeus' political loyalties thus exemplifies, according to Walbank, that shift in allegiance which characterizes Achaean politics at the turn of the third to the second centuries.⁴

There is only one piece of evidence which

can be adduced to support this contention. This is Alcaeus' epigram (*AP* ix. 518):

μακύνου τείχη, Ζεῦ, 'Ολύμπια πάντα Φιλίππῳ
ἀμβατά· χαλκείας κλείε πύλας μακάρων.
χθών μὲν δὴ καὶ πόντος ὑπὸ σκήπτροισι
Φιλίππου
δέδμηται· λοιπὰ δ' ἅ πρὸς 'Ολυμπον ὁδός.⁵

Were it not for this poem, it would not have been argued by anyone that Alcaeus had ever been a supporter of Philip V.⁶ In 1934 I took the epigram to be serious praise of Philip; in 1940 Walbank in his admirable monograph on Philip thought it to be "sarcastic."⁷ We are confronted with a reversal of alliances: Walbank now holds that *AP* ix. 518 is praise seriously intended, while I have become convinced that the epigram is, in fact, bitter sarcasm. But before discussing the epigram in detail, it is first necessary to clear away certain preliminary points.

In support of his contention that *AP* ix. 518 is, in fact, honest praise of Philip, Momigliano⁸ has adduced *AP* ix. 526 by Alpheius of Mitylene, which is indisputably an imitation of Alcaeus' epigram and is also without question serious praise of Rome. There can be no doubt at all that Alpheius when he read Alcaeus' poem took it to be in praise of Philip. But Alpheius, a man of a very different age, is quite capable of missing the point of Alcaeus' sophisticated and subtle epigram. Alpheius'

¹ Thorough critical discussion of the texts of the epigrams considered here is given by Walbank in his paper, and it has not seemed necessary, for the purposes of this study, to consider manuscript variants and emendations.

² For the divergent views which have been held concerning *AP* ix. 518 see Momigliano, *op. cit.*, pp. 53, n. 2, and 54, n. 4; Walbank, *CQ*, XXXVI (1942), 134, with nn. 3 and 4.

³ *HSCP*, XLV (1934), 214, n. 4; Walbank, *Philip V*, p. 120 and n. 5.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 53-54.

¹ "Alcaeus of Messene, Philip V, and Rome," *CQ*, XXXVI (1942), 134-45, and XXXVII (1943), 1-13; see also *ibid.*, XXXVIII (1944), 87-88. A. Momigliano, "Terra marique," *JRS*, XXXII (1942), 53-64, should also be consulted.

² These are: *AP* vii. 247; ix. 519; xi. 12; and xvi. 5.

³ See Walbank, *Philip V of Macedon* (Cambridge, 1940), pp. 73-79.

⁴ *CQ*, XXXVII (1943), 13.

imitation cannot safely be used for the interpretation of *AP* ix. 518.⁹

Much more significant is Walbank's association of *AP* ix. 518 with the anonymous epigram celebrating the dedication by the Rhodians of the Colossus to Helios (*AP* vi. 171), which we may call the "Rhodian Dedication":

αὐτῷ σοὶ πρὸς Ὀλυμπον ἐμακύναντο κολοσσὸν
τόνδε Ῥόδον ναέται Δωρίδος, Ἀέλιε,
χάλκεον, ἀνίκα κῦμα κατευνάσαντες
Ἑνυοῦς
ἔσπεψαν πάτραν δυσμενέων ἐνάροις.
5. οὐ γὰρ ὑπὲρ πελάγους μόνον ἔκτισαν,
ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐν γῇ
ἀδρὸν ἀδουλῶτου φέγγος ἐλευθερίας
τοῖς γὰρ ἀφ' Ἑρακλῆος ἀεξηθεῖσι γενέθ-
λας
πατριος ἐν πόντῳ κῆν χθονὶ κοιρανία.

I have argued elsewhere that the Rhodian Dedication becomes fully intelligible only if the last distich is interpreted as a taunt aimed at Demetrius I.¹⁰ Walbank holds that Alcaeus in *AP* ix. 518 "meant his flattery of Philip to be a retort to the Rhodian taunt levelled at Philip's great-grandfather, Demetrius Poliorcetes."¹¹ This I cannot accept. But there can be no doubt whatsoever of the close verbal relationship between the two poems which Walbank so rightly stresses. Both epigrams have the rare verb *μακύνασθαι* and the phrase *πρὸς Ὀλυμπον*. One may note also the adjective *χάλκεον* in line 3 of the Rhodian Dedication and *χαλκείας* in line 2 of Alcaeus' epigram. And the "land and sea" motif, is, of course, common to and heavily emphasized in both. Alcaeus in composing *AP* ix. 518 was without doubt strongly influenced by the Rhodian Dedication. But too much weight is not to be placed

on Alcaeus' borrowings. *ἐμακύναντο* is used in the Rhodian Dedication of the erecting of the Colossus; in Alcaeus' epigram *μακύνον* is used in exhorting Zeus to heighten the walls of Olympus. *πρὸς Ὀλυμπον* in the Dedication refers to the direction toward which the Colossus was raised, i.e., toward heaven, while in Alcaeus the phrase refers to the only route which remains for Philip to take. *χάλκεον* in the Rhodian Dedication describes the Colossus; *χαλκείας* in *AP* ix. 518 describes the gates of heaven. Furthermore, the land-and-sea motif in Alcaeus' epigram clearly refers to an already accomplished fact, while in the last distich of the Dedication the motif is little more than a vague general claim. The verbal influence of the Rhodian Dedication on Alcaeus' poem is indisputable. But the only recurrence of an *idea* is in Alcaeus' use of the land-and-sea motif. A close comparison, therefore, of the two epigrams does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that *AP* ix. 518 is a "retort" to the last distich of the Rhodian Dedication.

Most instructive, also, is the comparison of *AP* ix. 518 with the anonymous epigram commemorating Philip's successful campaign in Thrace (*AP* xvi. 6 [Planudean Appendix]):

κοίρανος Εὐρώπας, ὃ καὶ εἰν ἀλὶ καὶ κατὰ
χέρσον,
τόσσον ἀναξ θνατῶν, Ζεὺς ὅσον ἀθανάτων,
Εἰνοδίᾳ τὰ λάφυρ' Ἑκάτῃ θρασέος Κιροῦδα,
καὶ τέκνων καὶ ὅλας γὰς ἔθετ' Ὀδρυσίδος,
νίδος ἔμμελῖα Δαματρίων' ἀ δὲ Φιλίππου
δόξα πάλιν θείων ἄγχι βέβακε θρόνων.¹²

The first distich of Alcaeus' epigram means, and can only mean, that, if Zeus does not take appropriate defensive measures, Philip will take Olympus itself! Now *AP* xvi. 6 is extravagant enough praise of Philip, but it goes nowhere nearly so far as does Alcaeus. Note lines 5-6 of the anonymous epigram: "The fame of Philip has once again come near the divine thrones." This is forthright, but it is a very long way from asserting, as does Alcaeus without any equivocation whatever, that Philip is all but strong enough to take Olympus from

⁹ Walbank (*CQ*, XXXVI [1942], 135) is justly cautious: "The imitation by Alpheus of Mitylene . . . is certainly quite serious in tone—a strong argument, yet not wholly conclusive, since a writer two centuries later might well miss an irony apparent to a contemporary reader, who knew the circumstances in which the epigram was composed."

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, pp. 220-21; accepted by Walbank, *CQ*, XXXVI (1942), 135. Momigliano's remarks (*op. cit.*, p. 55) I do not entirely understand.

¹¹ *CQ*, XXXVI (1942), 136.

¹² See Walbank's discussion (*ibid.*, pp. 137-45).

Zeus! In the anonymous epigram (l. 2) Philip is called "as much the king of mortals as Zeus is of immortals." This is strong stuff, but it very clearly distinguishes the sphere of Philip from that of Zeus and implies unmistakably the limitations of the former. Alcaeus asserts Philip's mastery over land and sea without qualification, while the anonymous poet (l. 1) speaks of the king as the "lord of Europe, both on sea and upon land." Here there is a very significant geographical limitation on Philip's *κοιρανία*.¹³ The comparison of *AP* xvi. 6 with Alcaeus' epigram does, in my view, demonstrate how impossibly extravagant is the latter, if it is taken as serious flattery. In fact, *AP* ix. 518 is not laudatory at all; it is an ironic or, to be accurate, a bitterly sarcastic epigram. Momigliano asserts that "the ironical intention does not appear in the text and has been assumed only because Alcaeus wrote some epigrams against Philip V [italics mine]."¹⁴ On the contrary, a close examination of *AP* ix. 518 leads to the conclusion that the tone and the intention of the epigram are sarcastic in the extreme.

The first distich runs: "Heighten, Zeus, the Olympian walls. Everything is scalable [*ἀμβαρά*] to Philip. Close the bronze gates of the blessed gods." The meaning of these lines is that, unless Zeus takes concrete defensive measures, Philip will take Olympus itself by force of arms. Now scaling or conquering Olympus was not a legitimate activity for mortal men, heroes, or reputable divinities. The most notorious attempt to take Olympus by storm was that of the Alodae, the classic symbols of wanton and overweening pride and

ambition, who hence became associated with such creatures as the Titans and the Giants.¹⁵ What Alcaeus means is that Philip has been, and is, capable of "Giant-like" behavior. That it is the correct interpretation is shown by the emphatic position of *ἀμβαρά* as the first word in line 2. *ἀμβατός* is a rare poetic word. It occurs but twice in Homer. In *Il.* vi. 433-34 Andromache asks Hector to station his people by the wild fig tree "where the city is particularly scalable" (*ἐνθα μάλιστα/ἀμβατός ἐστι πόλις*). But it is the second passage (*Od.* xi. 316) which is decisive, for it describes the attempt of Otus and Ephialtes to storm Olympus (*Od.* xi. 315-19):

"Ὅσσαν ἐπ' Οὐλύμπω μέμασαν θέμεν, αὐτὰρ ἐπ' Ὅσσην

Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἔν' οὐρανὸς ἀμβατός εἴη.
καὶ νῦν κεν ἐξετέλεσσον, εἰ ἦβης μέτρον ἴκοντο·
ἀλλ' ὄλεσεν Διὸς υἱὸς, δν ἡκόμος τέκε Λητώ,
ἀμφοτέρω.

This passage of the *Odyssey* gave the adjective *ἀμβατός* an association with *οὐρανός* which it was not to lose.¹⁶ This association appears strikingly in Pindar *Pythian* 10. 27: *ὁ χάλκεος οὐρανὸς οὐ ποτ' ἀμβατὸς αὐτῷ*.¹⁷ Heaven is not

¹³ Cf. Toepffer, *RE*, I, 1592: "... treten sie [i.e., the Alodae] dann hinüber auf die Seite der Wesen, welche wie die Titanen und Giganten in dem Gefühle ihrer Kraft oder wie Prometheus in dem natürlichen Übermüte menschlicher Kultur sich trotzig und frevelnd gegen die olympischen Götter erheben und der verdienten Strafe nicht entgehen [italics mine]."

¹⁴ Walbank (*CQ*, XXXVII [1943], 10, n. 4) rightly asserts that *ἀμβαρά* in *AP* ix. 518 "links Philip's attempt on Olympus with the attempt of Otus and Ephialtes. . . ." Precisely. But how can a "link" between Philip and the Alodae be thought to be laudatory?

¹⁵ Cited by Walbank (*CQ*, XXXVI [1942], 136, n. 3), who remarks: "... the reference to Olympus pitches the tone of the epigram very high indeed [my italics], as can be seen from Pindar, *Pyth.* x. 27 . . . : the phraseology comes very near that of deification. . . ." Actually, the tone of *AP* ix. 518, if taken seriously, is much too high, impossibly high. I am not familiar with any passage of Hellenistic poetry in which it is suggested that a living ruler can (or would want to, which is the heart of the matter) reach Olympus by force. The feeling of Hellenistic poets on this matter is admirably illustrated by the epigram of Asclepiades of Samos on Lysippus' statue of Alexander (*AP* xvi. 120), wherein (l. 4) Alexander is made to say: γὰρ ὅτ' ἐμὸν τιθέμεναι Ζεῦ, σὺ δ' Ὀλύμπου ἔχε. (The manuscripts attribute the poem to the otherwise unknown poet Archelaus, as well as to Asclepiades; but

¹³ One may suggest that the phrase *κοιρανὸς Εὐρώπας* is probably a "retort" to a contemporary claim that Antiochus III was *κοιρανὸς Ἀσίας*. Antiochus held his triumphal entry into Seleucia on the Tigris in celebration of his eastern campaigns in 205/4 (Holleaux, *CAH*, VIII, 142), and, as Walbank has shown, *AP* xvi. 6 was composed in or shortly after 204. Even though it now appears that Antiochus did not take the title *βασιλεὺς μέγας* until after his victory at Panion (Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques*, III, 180-81 [*BCH*, XLIII (1930), 262]), his eastern victories would surely have inspired court poets to address him as "lord of Asia." For the term "Asia" see Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria and India* (Cambridge, 1938), pp. 153-54 and 195.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 53.

scalable by mortal man. *ἀμβρατός*, aside from Alcaeus' epigram here under discussion, seems next to appear in Lucian's *Charon* (chap. 4).¹⁸ Hermes and Charon have been discussing the best way of getting to heaven and are considering piling Pelion on Ossa like the sons of Aloeus. Charon objects that the task is too much for the two of them, but Hermes overrides him, stating: *ὁ δὲ γεννάδας "Ὅμηρος ἀπὸ δυοῖν στίχων ἀντίκα ἡμῖν ἀμβρατὸν ἐποίησε τὸν οὐρανόν, οὕτω ῥαδίως συνθεῖς τὰ ὄρη* ("Good Homer, however, has made it possible for us to scale heaven in a jiffy with a pair of verses, for he puts mountains together as easily as that").¹⁹ And a few sentences farther on, Lucian with a direct quotation of *Od.* xi. 315-16 clinches the allusion. Alcaeus' *ἀμβρατά* is therefore decisive for his equation of Philip with the Aloadae and such Giant-like beings. *AP* ix. 518 gets its whole meaning and point from the implication that Philip's character and behavior are indistinguishable from those of the Giants.²⁰ This gives added color to Alcaeus' identification of Philip with the Cyclops in *AP* ix. 519 and xi. 12,²¹ for the

Cyclopes were closely associated with the Giants.²²

It is now apparent that the actual meaning of the first distich of *AP* ix. 518 is that Zeus is to take the necessary defensive measures if Philip is not forcibly to scale Olympus as Otus and Ephialtes attempted to do. Moreover, the clause *πάντα Φιλίππῳ/ἀμβρατά*, through the Homeric allusion implicit in *ἀμβρατά*, definitely suggests that there are no accepted moral sanctions which Philip respects. The second distich runs: "Land, forsooth, and sea are subdued beneath the sceptres of Philip. But there remains the road to Olympus." Here the intended meaning is that Philip's wanton, Giant-like actions have brought land and sea under his dominion, and there remains only for him to attempt (as the necessary consequence of his character) the road to Olympus itself, that is, to follow the example of Otus and Ephialtes and suffer the same crushing overthrow, the same merited chastisement for immoral pride and overweening ambition.

AP ix. 518, therefore, is *not* laudatory; it is ironical or, rather, bitterly sarcastic. But we have to proceed further. Walbank has acutely pointed out that "Alcaeus seems to have shared the Cynic love of parody" and that "this addiction to parody lends a special point, not hitherto remarked, to Philip's reply by parody to the epigram [by Alcaeus] on Cynoscephalae."²³ *AP* ix. 518 is actually the sarcastic parody of a laudatory epigram; it is a mock eulogy. Cast in the form of an encomium, it is distinguished by a calculated, though superficial, ambiguity.²⁴ It is to be noted that this is very similar to the method employed by Alcaeus in *AP* ix. 519 and xi. 12, where the bitterest and most vicious invective is cast in

there seems little doubt that the epigram is by Asclepiades and is a companion piece to *AP* xvi. 119 by Asclepiades' friend and associate, Posidippus. I note that the epigram has been included in the recent edition of Asclepiades by William and M. Wallace [*Asclepiades of Samos* (New York, 1941), pp. 86 and 103]. The views of Schott [*Posidippi epigrammata* (Berlin, 1905), pp. 83-85], who attributes *AP* xvi. 119 to Asclepiades (!) and 120 to Archelaus, are needlessly involved.)

¹⁸ *ἀμβρατά* is a manuscript variant in Eratosthenes, *Frag.* 16, l. 14 (see Powell, *Collectanea Alexandrina* (Oxford, 1925), pp. 62-63). Line 14 is corrupt and defective.

¹⁹ The rendering of A. M. Harmon in the "Loeb Classical Library" edition.

²⁰ One need only recall the role of the Titans and Giants in Hellenistic sculpture, best known to us from the School of Pergamum, to grasp the full import of Alcaeus' equation of Philip with the Aloadae.

²¹ See Walbank's excellent and thorough discussion of these epigrams (*CQ*, XXXVII [1943], 3-6), which also show obvious borrowings from Homer. But I am not completely convinced that the construction of *AP* xi. 12, ll. 1-2, permits the identification of Philip with the Centaur, notwithstanding Theopompus (*FGH* 115 F. 225) and Sturtevant's argument (It is certainly not a demonstration) in *CP* (XXX [1926], 235-49) that Φάειρος is a conscious translation by or for Macedonians of the Thracian κένταυρος (exploited by Walbank, *CQ*, XXXVIII [1944], 87-88).

²² E.g., *Od.* vii. 206: ὡς περ Κίχλωπες τε καὶ ἄγρια φύλα Γίγαντων.

²³ *CQ*, XXXVII (1943), 10-11. Note that *AP* ix. 520, surely also by Philip, is a retort, in the form of a mock epitaph on Alcaeus, to the latter's charges of poisoning.

²⁴ A striking example of this technique is *AP* vii. 406 by Alcaeus' older and more competent contemporary, Theodoridas. Seemingly, the epigram is a rather charming epitaph on the poet Euphorion; in fact, it is a most offensive *double entendre* (see P. Maas, "Zu einigen hellenistischen Spottepigrammen," *Studi italiani di filologia classica*, XV [1938], 80).

the form of *παίγνια*, poems to be recited at a drinking party. These considerations place us in a better position to apprehend the reason for the demonstrable influence of the Rhodian Dedication (*AP* vi. 171) on Alcaeus' poem, for the point to the concluding distich of the Dedication is an ironical allusion to the pretensions of the Antigonids to Argead, i.e., Heraclid, descent.²⁵

If this interpretation of *AP* ix. 518 is correct, there is no direct evidence that Alcaeus had ever been a supporter of Philip V. Walbank has, however, adduced two other epigrams by Alcaeus to support his contention that the poet in the earlier phase of his career had been pro-Macedonian.²⁶ The first of these is *AP* vii. 412, a laudatory epitaph on the famous professional singer, Pylades. At the Nemean festival of 205, Pylades was engaged in a performance of Timotheus' *Persae* and had just begun the famous first line, *κλεινὸν ἐλευθερίας τεύχων μέγαν Ἑλλάδι κόσμον*,²⁷ when Philopoemen entered the theater. The enthusiasm for the victor of the battle of Mantinea was naturally great, and Walbank holds that "the story certainly suggests" that Pylades "shared the enthusiasm he helped to inspire." The argument is that this incident shows that Pylades was in his personal political sympathies pro-Achaean and the fact that Alcaeus wrote the epitaph on Pylades suggests that the poet himself shared those sympathies. The second epigram (*AP* ix. 588) is in honor of the Theban wrestler and pancratis, Cleitomachus.²⁸ Boeotia was, of course, a member of the Macedonian Symmarchy down to 197, and Walbank uses an anecdote related by Polybius (xxvii. 9), in which Cleitomachus appears in a favorable light, as evidence which "at least links Cleito-

machus with Polybius and the Achaean camp." As regards Alcaeus, Walbank maintains that *AP* ix. 588 "justifies the same kind of conclusions as might legitimately be drawn about a Frenchman who should (in 1942) write an epigram in honor of Max Schmeling."

But professional artists and athletes were, in the Hellenistic period, ordinarily itinerant and very nonpolitical personages, and hence these two epigrams can hardly be used as evidence for Alcaeus' own views, particularly since we have no evidence at all for the dates of their composition. Very conceivably they can have been written some years after Cynoscephalae and Flamininus' proclamation at the Isthmian Games, when the political situation in Greece had changed entirely. *AP* vii. 412 and ix. 588 need show no more than that Alcaeus admired the professional accomplishments of Pylades and Cleitomachus.

In fact, Alcaeus' praise of the Theban Cleitomachus is quite without political significance,²⁹ for the late Michel Feyer in his admirable monograph on the history of Boeotia in the last half of the third century has convincingly demonstrated that Boeotia was, in fact, neutral during both the Social and the First Macedonian Wars.³⁰ Therefore, during the last two decades of the third century there was no political reason whatsoever to prevent a Messenian poet from composing an epigram in honor of a Theban athlete, and hence *AP* ix. 588 permits no conclusions as to a pro-Achaean or pro-Macedonian attitude on the part of Alcaeus.

The case of Pylades is less clear cut. Pausanias specifically states that Pylades was a Megalopolitan and a Pythian victor,³¹ and there is

²⁵ Walbank's association of *AP* ix. 518 with Philip's successes in 201 (*CQ*, XXXVI [1942], 137, and *Philip V*, p. 120) is very attractive. But I believe that the epigram gains greatly in point and relevance if it was composed at a time when it had already become apparent that the Romans were to intervene against Philip, that is, late in 201 or early in 200.

²⁶ *CQ*, XXXVII (1943), 12-13.

²⁷ Timotheus, *Frag.* 14, in J. M. Edmonds, *Lyra Graeca* ("Loeb Classical Library"), III, 305-6.

²⁸ See Honigsmann, *RE*, XI, 659-60. *AP* ix. 588 was clearly inscribed on the base of the statue of Cleitomachus at Olympia mentioned by Pausanias (vi. 15. 3-5).

²⁹ Another epigram of Alcaeus (*AP* xvi. 7 [Planudean Appendix]) is on the Theban flutist, Dorotheus.

³⁰ Michel Feyer, *Polybe et l'histoire de Béotie au III^e siècle avant notre ère* ("Bibliothèque des écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome," Fasc. 152 [Paris, 1942]), Part I, chaps. iv and v, pp. 136-80. But Feyer's view of the sinister and decisive role played by Philip V in the internal history of the Greek states belonging to the symmarchy during the last twenty years of the third century (summarized, pp. 304-6) seems to me, at best, very oversimplified.

³¹ viii. 50. 3: Πολύδου δὲ Μεγαπολίτου μὲν ἄνδρὸς γένος, κισσαροῦ δὲ τῶν ἐφ' αὐτοῦ δοκιμασάντων καὶ ἀνηρημένων Πυθικῶν νικῶν. Hitzig and Bluemner (*Pausanias Graeciae descriptio*, III, Pars prior [Leipzig, 1907], 296) in their

no cogent reason to doubt Pausanias' assertion. It is therefore very understandable that Pylades should have "shared the enthusiasm he helped to inspire" for Philopoemen at the Nemean Games of 205. But does the fact that Alcaeus composed a laudatory epitaph on a Megalopolitan singer necessarily mean that the Messenian shared the political views of Megalopolis and the Achaean League? Hardly. All we know about the death of Pylades is that it occurred at some unknown time after the Nemean Games of 205. If, as is possible, Pylades died after the late fall of 198, when the Achaean League had broken with Philip and joined Rome and the Macedonian king's Greek enemies, among whom was Messenia, then *AP* vii. 412 raises no problem at all. But, even had Pylades died earlier, the epigram need show only that Alcaeus admired him as an artist.³²

commentary on this passage assert that Pausanias here derives from Plutarch *Philopoemen* 11. But Plutarch does not give Pylades' city or his Pythian victory. It is evident that Pausanias is here using a source either independent of, or additional to, Plutarch, and this source is very probably Polybius himself.

³² It is probable that Alcaeus had connections at Olympia and, at least occasionally, resided there (see *AP* xii. 64 and n. 28 above).

How little the career of a professional artist was affected by current politics is shown by the fact that Pylades himself had, at some unspecified date before 205, won a Pythian victory³³ at a period when Delphi was completely dominated by the Aetolian League and the political relations between the Achaeans and Aetolians were hostile or, at best, characterized by mutual aloofness and suspicion. *AP* vii. 412 does not, I feel, offer any support to Walbank's argument.

So far as we know, Alcaeus was always a "good Messenian." His embittered enmity to Philip V, expressed with brutal vigor in such poems as *AP* ix. 519 and xi. 12, in all probability goes back to Philip's attempts on Messene in 215 and 214.³⁴ There is no evidence that Alcaeus was at any time a supporter of Philip V, and no inferences are to be drawn from the poet's supposed change of allegiance.

CHARLES EDSON

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

³³ See above, n. 31.

³⁴ This is not to deny the possibility that Alcaeus may have been little more than a boy when these events took place.

BOOK REVIEWS

Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity. By WILFRED L. KNOX. ("Schweich Lectures of the British Academy" [1942].) London: Oxford University Press, 1944. Pp. 108.

This volume of "Schweich Lectures" is a more than worthy sequel to the earlier work of Canon Knox.¹ It shows, throughout, wide knowledge at first hand of voluminous and scattered source material and a candid and powerful mind, fully aware of the difficulties and keenly determined to wrestle with them. Closely written, it demands and repays close reading.

"The object of these lectures is to study some of the methods by which the Gospel preached by Jesus in Galilee, a remote backwater of an insignificant Roman province, was converted into a system that could gain a hearing in the civilized world and could end by conquering it. The hellenization of the Gospel was inevitable." Knox reminds us that there was no complete cleavage of "Palestinian" and "Hellenistic" Judaism and that, preponderantly Palestinian as is the Synoptic tradition, the influence of Greek modes of thought and speech is evident even in Mark. (This corresponds to the Galilean scene: Jewish but with Hellenism, not, indeed, of the highest type, in and around.) Knox makes various interesting observations on classical tendencies in Luke-Acts as shown by vocabulary and rhythm; particularly happy is the use of ancient rhetorical teaching as to sound-combinations which were thought to be harsh. There can be no doubt as to the relevance of such considerations. Any man who read Greek in texts without word-division must have had conventional training in grammar; any man who wrote Greek for an audience had at least the rudiments of rhetoric. The desire for fine writing, as for cultivation in general, was

widespread and was fully compatible with frequent lapses.²

Rhythm is sometimes accidental, and I cannot agree with Knox when he argues that, in the quotation from Amos in Acts 7:43, "beyond Babylon" is substituted for "beyond Damascus" because the first phrase gives a good rhythm and the second a bad one. If prose-rhythm or correctness were in the writer's mind, would he not have dealt far more drastically with the passage? (It appears that Philo tolerated hiatus when quoting Scripture.³) Could not "beyond Babylon" mean "banishment to some place even more remote than the traditional scene of the Exile"—unless it is a simple slip of memory or pen? Nevertheless, this type of inquiry is well worth further application.

On the side of content, also, Knox is helpful. He rightly reminds us that the miraculous is not necessarily Hellenistic rather than Jewish⁴ and that, in spite of what the casual reader might think, Matt. 11:25 (which in a sense anticipates the tone of the Fourth Gospel) is Semitic. Here we have a specific model, Ecclus. 51, and know something of the general type of thanksgiving which is here given a special cast.⁵ Often we are less fortunate; just when did *parakletos*, which is but superficially Greek,⁶ crystallize? A long secret evolution lies

¹ Cf. J. de Zwaan in Jackson-Lake, *Beginnings of Christianity*, II, 34 ff.; and *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XVII (1924), 145 ff., where it is suggested that Acts is posthumous. The hexameter opening of Tac. *Ann.* I. 1 remains as a striking oversight.

² F. H. Colson, *Philo*, VIII, 429.

³ Cf. E. R. Goodenough, *By Light, Light*, pp. 187 f. (Philo as softening the miraculous element in the Exodus story); Nock, *Class. Rev.*, LVII (1943), 80, n. 1; H. A. Wolfson, *Philo*, I, 347 ff. H. J. Cadbury ("Style and Literary Method of Luke," *Harvard Theol. Stud.*, VI, 118) notes a general tendency of Luke to tone down strong language.

⁴ Cf. *P. mag. Gr.*, IV, 215 (I, p. 78 [Preisendanz]); the text discussed by Nock, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXVII (1934), 53 ff. ("O happy folk that dwell in . . . holy Talmis . . .") corresponds to the final exhortation). For the thanksgiving cf. also Philo *Leg. all.* III. 27.

⁵ N. Johannson, *Parakletoi* (Dissertation, Lund, 1940).

¹ He has since published a remarkable paper on the Epistle of James in *Jour. Theol. Stud.*, Vol. XLVI (1945). Will he not give us a study of Hebrews?

behind much of the language of early Christianity and the *Hermetica*, as it lies behind the fixed formulas of Greek epic.

At one point I must dissent; it is when Knox says (p. 21): "On the other hand, Luke is a true hellenist in the sense that he has really grasped the fact that if history is to give instruction of this kind it must be true history." I do not suggest that Luke—or the Chronicler—knowingly falsified or accepted falsifications but that Luke took edifying material where he found it and wove it into a whole with no little skill in creating atmosphere and in effecting transitions, probably without clear awareness of the gaps and inconsistencies in the resulting story. Luke 1:1-4 and 3:1-2 show that he knew the accepted stylistic forms of history. That is all; after the opening there is no attempt at precise chronology, nor would it have been possible. I Maccabees supplies a contrast.

The first lecture is followed by two notes, one on the infancy narratives (with useful material on supernatural births in Jewish story) and one on the speeches in Acts. The second lecture discusses the indebtedness of early Christian preaching and theology to Hellenistic Judaism and begins appropriately with Rom. 1:18 ff. Knox remarks earlier: "Judaism was not a theological religion"; as Hellenized, it began to be one. This came not from assimilation but from the use of the Greek language. Old beliefs were expressed in words with altogether different associations, alternative meanings (e.g., *Logos*), and new powers of combination. The application of Greek thought came later and produced the first attempt at a psychology of revealed religion.⁷

Philo's depth of Hellenism probably much exceeded the average, even in Alexandria;⁸ but his writings as used by Knox are highly pertinent, e.g., for the way in which proof texts were used. It is the old rabbinic exegesis, operating with Greek ideas but interpreting in the traditional atomistic way, jot by jot and tittle by tittle. (The Greeks also "interpreted" earlier

literature in a manner felt to be analogous. Commonly they paid far less close attention to the verbal details; they emphasized content and consecutive sense rather than phrasing, and they had simpler apologetic aims—to get rid of what seemed unbecoming and to invest new ideas with the dignity of age.⁹ Yet Porphyry *De antro nympharum* 14 on the "stone loom-beams" etc., in *Od.* xiii. 105 ff. is comparable with Philo; and this is the more noteworthy since *ap. Stob.* ii. 1. 32, ii. 14 f. [W.], he blames Cronius for reading his own ideas into ancient myth.) The difference is that the Christians had a single meaning to emphasize, whereas Philo could allow himself a wide range of "free association."

This lecture merits the attention of all students of Paul and of the Fourth Gospel. I have two reservations. First, Knox seems to me to ascribe somewhat too much concreteness to *logos* and to *soter*. In general, *soter* was a descriptive word (expressing gratitude) and *logos* was interpretative. Since the Septuagint applied *soter* to individual judges,¹⁰ Philo need not be credited with too much repugnance for its conventional use for human beings. *Soter* became specific when applied to Jesus—e.g., in John 4:42, *P. Oxy.*, 840, and the *ΙΧΘΥΣ* formula. Again, is it not a slight exaggeration to say: "The Fourth Gospel uses the same imagery to prove that Jesus is the *Logos* of Greek philosophy manifested on the stage of history" (p. 44)? We are not yet in the world of Justin Martyr—though, in view of the "Greeks" in 12:20 ff., it is fair to say that the writer thought of the *Logos* on the plane of human, as well as on that of cosmic, universality.

Second, I doubt very much the proposition

⁷ For awareness of the analogy cf. Porphyry *ap. Eus. HE* vi. 19. 8 and A. Miura-Stange, "Celsus u. Origenes," *Beih. z. neutest. Wiss.*, IV (1926), 54 ff. When Porphyry (*Antr. nymph.* 3 f.) says, in effect, "This is really hard; so we must find a meaning," and when Sallustius 3 (p. 4, l. 17) speaks of the value of difficult myths, there is something like the Philonic principle that deep meaning may lie in passages of Scripture which are, on the face of it, hard. Porphyry presses the meaning of words in his *Qu. Hom. ad. II.*, e.g., I. 2 f. (Schrader), where *πρωταρχος* in *II.* 1. 3 is explained as "sent before others" to avoid a supposed inconsistency with *vi.* 488. Further study is perhaps desirable.

¹⁰ Judges 3:9, 15; cf. *II Ezra* 19:27.

⁷ Cf. Wolfson, *op. cit.*, II, 528, s.v. "Soul"; 514, s.v. "Grace."

⁸ Cf. Noek, *AJP*, LXIII (1942), 479, and *Anglican Theol. Rev.*, XXV (1943), 223 ff. (adding a reference to P. Flebzig, *Orient. Lit.-Zeitung*, XLIII [1940], 245 ff.); Wolfson, *op. cit.*, I, 91 ff.

(p. 40) that "Philo has consistently eliminated eschatology and the Messiah from his writings, and in view of his carelessness in revising his sources, this can only mean that the whole tradition of Alexandrine teaching had done so for him," and the comment on Philo's interpretation of Zech. 6:12 (p. 41): "It would seem that in this case at least Judaism had followed Gentile theology in equating its 'saviour' with the divine Logos and so eliminating the awkward figure of the Messiah, just as St. Paul does when he represents Jesus not simply as the Messiah who is shortly to wind up the world-process, but as the divine Wisdom who was the agent of creation." Philo cherished the idea of the Day of the Lord and has an occasional reference to the Lord's Anointed agent.¹¹ Nevertheless, although Christians quoted Zech. 6:12 as a Messianic text, the use which Philo makes of it (*Conf. ling.* 62) does not involve the substitution of one meaning for another. Philo was not interpreting this text as he interpreted the Pentateuch: it was one of the passages suggested to him by the word *anatoiai* in Gen. 11:2, and he explained it in terms of his favorite Heavenly Man. The Messiah's role as triumphant monarch appears in the Greek Sibyllina just as in the Aramaic Judaism of the paintings of the Dura synagogue;¹² but there is no reason to suppose that he was at any time given a philosophic interpretation. Elimination is not a probable hypothesis; political caution is conceivable¹³ but not likely; and there was nothing here like the later theological demand for caution with reference to cosmogony and to the Chariot story in Ezekiel and to anything that might savor of the heresy of "two powers," nothing like the rejection of the messianic interpretation of Psalm 110 as used by Christians.¹⁴

No; we must credit the Christian movement

¹¹ Like Colson (*op. cit.*, VIII, 418 n.), I see no personal Messiah in *Praem. poen.* 165 (cf. Wolfson, *op. cit.*, II, 415). Leisegang's Index records no quotation from Daniel.

¹² Cf. A. Grabar, *Rev. hist. rel.*, cxxiii-iv (1941); and H. Riesenfeld, *Jésus transfiguré*, pp. 54 ff.

¹³ For messianism as liable to be misunderstood cf. John 19:12; Justin *Apol.* I. 11; Hegesipp. *ap. Eus. HE* III. 20; Eus. *Mart. Pal.* 11. 11-12; also Justin I. 44. 12 (death penalty for readers of Hystaspes, Sibyl, the prophets).

¹⁴ Strack-Billerbeck, *Komm.*, IV, 452 ff.

in its beginnings with the originality of inferring that God's agent in redemption was also his agent in creation, of thus giving in Jesus concreteness to the popular abstraction of Sophia—so often equated with the living and comprehensive actuality of Torah ("law" and "revelation")—or to the more philosophic-sounding *Logos*, "word" and "reason," which could imply the same equation.¹⁵

Thus they expressed belief in a parallelism between Jesus and the Father, a belief shown in Matt. 11:27 and in the Kyrios terminology with its Aramaic background. This was new. I Cor. 1:24 does not necessarily imply the equation of Jesus with a personified or hypostatized Wisdom, but it shows the feelings and beliefs which produced hypostatization. Further, Paul's statement to the Colossians is presented not as a revelation or new teaching but as something no less axiomatic than the simple creedal formulation of Rom. 1:1-4.

After a fine note on Philo's sources,¹⁶ we pass to the final lecture, which gives an analysis of the Fourth Gospel, with running comment. It is the best thing I know on the subject. For Knox the author is "like St. Paul the product of the mixed Greek-Jewish culture of the first century A.D." (p. 44), using the Synoptic tradition and the conceptual habits and associations of Hellenistic Judaism (not of Hellenism);¹⁷ and the structure of the didactic

¹⁵ On these hypostases cf. H. Ringgren, *Word and Wisdom* (Dissertation, Uppsala, 1947). The nearest thing that I know to a parallel for the identification of Jesus with the divine hypostasis is the equation by Simon Magus of himself with the Power of God. This might be a counterdevelopment, but Acts, chap. 8, does not suggest that Simon's claim was subsequent to the development of the Christian movement. Cf. Goodenough, *op. cit.*, pp. 199 ff., for the way in which Philo never goes beyond a certain point in the glorification of Moses; at most, there is something like an Assumption (such as is perhaps involved in the identification of Enoch with the Son of Man; cf. E. Sjöberg, *Der Menschensohn im äthiopischen Henochbuch* ["Acta R. Soc. hum. litt. Lundensis," Vol. XLI (1946)], pp. 147 ff.)—there is no Descent.

¹⁶ Note also p. 76, n. 1. In support of the argument (p. 47) about *Opif.* m. 89 ff., cf. F. Boll, *Neue Jahrb.*, XXXI (1913), 117, n. 1.

¹⁷ Note H. Almqvist, "Plutarch u. das N.T.," *Acta semin. neotestament. Upsaliensis*, XV (1946), 144, on the paucity of contacts between the Johannine writings and Plutarch; E. Percy, *Untersuchungen über den Ursprung der johanneischen Theologie*, p. 333, on the absence of *ἀναστασις* (found in I Cor. 15:53 f.). The Fourth Gospel shows a type of Semitic parallelism verging on the structure of verse.

sections sometimes resembles that of Hermetic revelation dialogues. The prologue is not for one moment to be regarded as standing apart from the book as a whole. (G. Kittel observes, in his remarkable article on *lógos*, that the writer never uses (*ὁ*) *lógos* in the plain sense to describe the teaching of Jesus, and he draws the inference.¹⁸)

On certain points I should dissent. The analogy drawn between the Fourth Gospel and the *Hermetica* is valid; we may add that the beginning of *Kore Kosmou*, with its cosmic *Vorspiel*, affords perhaps the closest analogy to John 1:1-18.¹⁹ Further, the "light and life" of *CH* 1 are comparable; here, too, there was a background of Hellenized Judaism, with all the possibilities which that could give for convergence. Nevertheless, the structural analogy belongs to the general type of revelation literature such as *Enoch*—and *Enoch* was heavenly scribe and had something in common with *Thoth*;²⁰ in the last analysis we are dealing with one form of the very common genus of frame-story.²¹

Again, I doubt the translation of *ἀληθινόν* in 1:9 as "full of truth" (p. 56, n. 2). Some such nuance might be present, for Greek words had a remarkable faculty for acquiring new meanings;²² but it is more natural to translate "true light" as distinct from ordinary physical light. Such uses of "truth," "light," etc., have been called "Gnostic"²³—not indeed by Knox. Is not the fact that, when such words were employed to express either Platonic transcen-

dentalism or revealed religion (or a fusion of the two), they necessarily acquired overtones and that these overtones passed into Syriac and Mandaean vernaculars, there to be enriched with the exuberance of Semitic poetry? So "truth" denotes a higher order;²⁴ Being as contrasted with Becoming, revelation as contrasted with everything else—not the plain yes-or-no truth of daily life or the honesty of a conventional transaction. True light in this sense in this context has the meaning given above, when on a lower plane it would mean "light" as distinct from some delusion of impaired vision. *Psychikos* in ordinary Greek is contrasted with "bodily"; the early Christian belief in the continuous control of the Spirit gave it a new sense, as contrasted with "spiritual"; and the usage of Christian Gnosis depends on this belief as expressed by Paul.²⁵

Further, I cannot accept the allegorical interpretation of the six consorts of the woman at the well of Samaria as representing the material world, and the five senses and the natural soul (p. 64). Quite apart from the fact that the relationship of the six to the woman was successive and not simultaneous, the writer of the

¹⁸ For "truth" contrast Sen. *Ep.* 90. 28: "mundus . . . culus vera simulacra verasque facies cernendas mentibus protulit," with Lucr. *iii.* 57: *verae voces*.

¹⁹ Bultmann (*op. cit.*, p. 171) follows Reitzenstein in emphasizing *psychikos*. In *P. mag. Gr.*, IV, 523 f. (i. p. 90 [Preisendanz]), *τῆς ἀπορώτης μου ψυχικῆς δυνάμεως*, the emphasis is on *ἀπορώτης*—the speaker's human power of soul as distinct from the divine spirit which for the moment replaces it and enables him to see the hidden things (cf. *ibid.*, IV, 210 [p. 78]: *μαγικὴν ψυχὴν ἔχων ἀδύσθητος*; A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*, I, 304). Cf., in general, G. Verbeke's excellent book, *L'Évolution de la doctrine du Pneuma*; for the Christian vocabulary cf. G. Kittel, *Lexicographia sacra* ("Theology," *Occasional Papers*, Vol. VII [1938]). For Gnosis, E. Percy's analysis in *Untersuchungen*, pp. 287 ff., is very helpful. I should add the point here made and the fact of variations within Judaism (Nock, *Gnomon*, XII [1936], 605 ff.). H. Lewy (*Encycl. Jud.*, VII, 455) remarks on the strong Jewish element in gnosticism. F. C. Burkitt (*Church and Gnosis*, p. 40) finds the Hebrew words in Gnostic texts largely spurious; yet they were trying to sound like Hebrew and a heretical Jew's knowledge of Hebrew might be very slight (cf., however, C. Bonner, *Harvard Theol. Rev.*, XXXVI [1943], 42 f.). So I find Judaism, not Christianity, in the *Hermetica* apart from Frag. 21. Christian infiltration is not inherently impossible; Numenius quoted John; and the Gnosticism against which Plotinus polemicized lay within the ken of Neo-Platonism; further, in the first half of the third century, Christianity by no means represented a world entirely apart. Nevertheless, I think the negative conclusion justified.

¹⁹ *Theol. Wtb. z. N.T.*, IV, 131 f. (contrast 115. 27 ff.). For the prologue cf. Aristobol. *ap. Eus. PE* xlii. 12. 9 f. (The sabbath is the birth of light, and light comes from Wisdom.)

²⁰ *Ap. Stob.* i. 49. 44 (p. 385 [W.]); Scott, *Hermetica*, I, 456. Cf. again the first sentence of Tac. *Ann.* i. 1; *reges habuere* gives the keynote of Rome's destiny (whereas the statement of the fact in Sall. *Cat.* 2 is neutral).

²¹ Compare the conversation between Jesus and Nicodemus with IV Ezra, chap. 4.

²² Cf. A. Torczyner, *Zeitschr. d. morgenl. Gesellsch.*, LXXXV (1931), 298 ff.

²³ Cf. Nock, "Mél. Fridrichsen" (forthcoming). This is distinct from the deliberate change of a word sense by an adjective with what is, on the face of it, an adjective of opposite meaning: *μῆθη νηφάλιος* (H. Lewy, *Sobria ebrietas*); *τῆς ἀσύμμελον . . . ἀρμονίαν* (Philo *Conf. ling.* 67); *φῶς ἀνίστατον* (cf. *Apul. Met.* xi. 15: *Fortunae, sed videntia*).

²⁴ So R. Bultmann, *Orient. Lit.-Zeitung*, XLIII (1940), 150 ff.

Fourth Gospel deals not in subtle suggestions but in facts and interpretations, set forth with the strongest emphasis.²⁶ We must regard the name of Siloam as significant because its meaning is given (9:7); even the tragic irony of 11:50 is made explicit. The writer is dramatic rather than symbolic. There are many other points in the book which it would be agreeable to discuss,²⁷ but let me end here with a strong commendation of these lectures both to New Testament scholars and to others who are concerned with the climate of opinion of the first century of our era.

ARTHUR DARBY NOCK

Harvard University

Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae volumen II. By E. K. RAND, J. J. SAVAGE, H. T. SMITH, G. B. WALDROP, J. P. ELDER, B. M. PEEBLES, and A. F. STOCKER. Lancaster, Pa.: American Philological Association, 1946. Pp. xxi+509. \$5.00 (to members of the Association, \$4.00).

The most immediately apparent improvement achieved by this handsome edition over the long standard *Servius* of Thilo and Hagen is in the presentation of the longer commentary (DS).¹ Since the general adoption of the view first set forth by K. Barwick² to the effect that DS was a combination of the vulgate *Servius* (S) with another distinct and homogeneous ancient commentary, the treatment accorded DS by Thilo and Hagen can no longer be justified. In agreement with E. Thomas,³ Thilo believed DS to consist of S, enlarged by a mass of notes of heterogeneous provenience and varying antiquity; and therefore he was less concerned in establishing the text of DS than that of the, to him, far more important S,

printing the latter in Roman type, whereas matter peculiar to DS was printed in italics, sometimes incorporated into S, sometimes subjoined in separate paragraphs. Material in DS which appeared to be of insufficient importance to be printed in the text was cited, as a rule, in the *apparatus criticus*; on some occasions, however, DS readings were not mentioned at all. Consequently, it is always difficult and sometimes impossible to determine from the text of the Thilo-Hagen edition what the readings of the DS manuscripts are in a given passage or, even with the help of the *apparatus*, to form an accurate idea of the running text of the DS tradition. In the present edition, where DS and S texts differ, they are printed in separate columns, DS to the left. When the material offered is common to both, it is printed across the page. Both DS and S manuscripts are provided with distinct *apparatus critici*; when variants having to do with the same word or passage occur in both *apparatus*, both entries are prefixed by asterisks.

Promising a full treatment of the question in their "Prolegomena," the editors do not discuss the relationship between DS and S except to state that it is generally agreed that there existed two continuous commentaries, at one time complete, which were combined in the seventh or eighth century by a scholar, apparently Irish, who made some unimportant additions of his own.⁴ At the time of combination, neither commentary, it is to be inferred, was in its original integral state. In view of this it appears unlikely that the compiler used a fuller or better text of S than that represented by the archetype of the surviving manuscripts of the S tradition (Σ); and, indeed, one of the editors has written, "His [the DS compiler's] *Servian* MS. was surely of the β class (very close to *AJK*)."⁵ Nevertheless, the editors regularly favor DS readings to those of the S tradition in passages common to both.

Another point which will doubtless be amply discussed in the "Prolegomena" is the question of the authorship of the non-Servian material in DS. Since the cogent statement of the case in favor of Aelius Donatus, made by

²⁶ Is not this an instance of the "x + 1" formula? She had five husbands; five was a nice round number (Strack-Billerbeck, *op. cit.*, III, 461), and the new consort was one more.

²⁷ H. Windisch, *Eucharisterion Gunkel*, II, 176.

¹ DS stands for the longer commentary. When reference is made to material found in the longer commentary but not in the vulgate *Servius* (S), the non-Servian nature of such material will be explicitly stated.

² "Zur *Serviusfrage*," *Philologus*, LXX (1911), 144.

³ *Essai sur Servius et son commentaire sur Virgile* (Paris, 1880).

⁴ *Praefatio*, p. III.

⁵ J. P. Elder, *HSCP*, LI (1940), 317.

E. K. Rand some years ago,⁶ this theory had steadily become more generally accepted until the recent stylometric study of A. H. Travis⁷ showed that, whatever might be true as to their substance, the non-Servian scholia of DS could hardly be regarded as stylistically Donatean.

Inasmuch as Donatus is believed to be one of the important sources of Servius, if the non-Servian part of DS were shown to be derived from Donatus (or from another commentary used by Servius), the problem of the relation between DS and S would not, perhaps, be simplified but could at least be more clearly formulated than is at present possible.

However, on most matters the necessarily compendious exposition in the *Praefatio* is satisfactorily supplemented by monographs published by one or another of the editors in the course of the last twenty years. The classification of the manuscripts used in establishing the text of S is, in the main, that of Savage and Waldrop,⁸ schematized by the latter on the basis of readings taken from the first three books of the commentary on the *Aeneid*, with the important addition of a third and independent family of S manuscripts (at the time of Waldrop's stemma represented only by the fragmentary V), for which we now have evidence up to xii. 164.

That V, used by Thilo in editing the commentary on the *Georgics*, contained the beginning of the S commentary to the *Aeneid* (including material hitherto attested only in Renaissance manuscripts which fills a gap at the end of the life of Virgil in Servius' *Praefatio*) was first observed by Savage. Waldrop then showed this portion of V to belong to neither of the recognized families of S manuscripts, although descended from the same archetype. Some years later A. F. Stocker⁹ demonstrated that the previously little-esteemed thirteenth-century manuscript W was,

in all likelihood, a copy made of V before the mutilation of the latter and, in consequence, deserving of the respect accorded to a tenth-century book. The VW class (σ) includes N as well, which, although basically σ , is a hybrid manuscript.

Of these three families of S manuscripts the first two (β and γ) had been recognized by Thilo; but in this edition they are represented by manuscripts chosen with greater discrimination than were those employed by him; the readings of the third are here made available for the first time.

The editors have taken far greater pains to reconstruct the text of DS than Thilo, influenced by his low opinion of the worth of these scholia, thought necessary. They are obliged to employ the same material as Thilo did, but they have been able to evaluate it more accurately in two important respects. First, Thilo believed that *Fv* (the notes taken by Modius and entered by Daniel in the margin of his Fabricius edition of Virgil) and *f* (the material taken from a Fulda manuscript for Daniel by Scioppius and printed by the former in the Appendix to his edition) were taken directly from the Cassellanus (C), but J. J. Savage¹⁰ has shown that this is not the case, and Elder¹¹ has reached the further conclusion that "Modius and Scioppius copied a MS. related to, but independent of, C." Second, it has been found that not only Thilo's second corrector of C represents the work of four nearly contemporary correctors, now labeled C², C⁴, C⁵, C⁶, but that C³, which Thilo ascribed to a man "correcting" the text of DS from a fifteenth-century printed text of S, obtained its S material in the eleventh or twelfth century.¹²

A striking example of the valuable use to which the rehabilitated DS may be put occurs in the case of *Aen.* ii. 572, cited by S in his *Praefatio* and DS in a scholium to ii. 566. In this edition the verse is printed thus in the *Praefatio*; in Book ii an *obliquus* before *Danaum* as well:

et Danaum poenas † et deserti coniugis ira;

et *Danaum poenas*) is the reading of σ , while the remaining S manuscripts read *et Danaum*

⁶ "Is Donatus's Commentary on Virgil Lost?" *CQ.* XXXIII (1916), 158-64.

⁷ "Donatus and the Scholia Daniellii," *HSCP*, LIII (1942), 157-69.

⁸ "The Manuscripts of Servius's Commentary on Virgil," *HSCP*, XLV (1934), 157-204; and G. B. Waldrop, "Evidences of Relationship in Certain Manuscripts of Servius," *HSCP*, XLV (1934), 205-12.

⁹ "A New Source for the Text of Servius," *HSCP*, LII (1941), 65-97.

¹⁰ "The Commentary of Servius Daniellii on Virgil," *HSCP*, XLVIII (1932), 91-92.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 317.

¹² *Praefatio*, pp. v-vi.

poenam, which Thilo accepts. Of the DS sources, C reads *et Danaum poenas*), whereas Daniel and presumably the Fulda manuscript collated by Scioppius (no variant is recorded in Daniel's Appendix) read *et poenas Danaum*. However, *et Danaum poenas* is certainly the DS reading; Daniel's *et poenas Danaum* is an attempt to mend the meter; and *et Danaum poenas* is shown by σ to be attested on the S side as well. It is therefore probable that the compiler of DS found the reading in both his Servian and his non-Servian commentaries (in the *Praefatio* of the one and the entry at ii. 566 in the other). Consequently, the position of the editors, who believe that the verse was left in an unfinished state by Virgil and cited without alteration by Servius and the non-Servian commentary, is a very strong one.

Reference has already been made to the frequency with which DS readings are preferred to those of S, where the text is represented in both traditions. This is particularly noticeable in passages which appear in DS sources but not in those that we possess for S, which in the great majority of cases the editors print in their text, with the annotation "*om. Σ* " in the *apparatus* to the manuscripts of the S commentary. In the *Praefatio* to the edition it is stated, "*quae vero trans paginam currunt, ea utrique commentario sunt communia*,"¹³ which indicates that the compiler is held to have found in his exemplar of S the passages which are printed in this manner. It is possible that we have here to do with an expedient adopted to avoid printing DS and S in separate columns where they offer substantially the same text. However, if the statement is taken at its face value, perplexity arises as to the grounds upon which DS is regarded in so many instances as better evidence for the text of S than is the consensus of the existing manuscripts which represent this tradition. Generally speaking, if the passages in question are not omissions of Σ , they must be additions of DS (to disregard the remote possibility that the scribe of some DS manuscript from which our sources are descended, other than the original compiler, is responsible for them). A priori it would seem less implausible that a compiler (DS) should make a certain number of additions, jotting

down glosses which subsequently found their way into the text and rephrasing his text to avoid brusque transitions at points where he joined material of one commentary to that of the other than that a copyist should make omissions with such regularity (and in the greater number of cases without apparent mechanical or paleographical reasons for so doing). If, as Elder suggests, the compiler used a Servian manuscript of the β group, that is, one descended from the S archetype Σ , which presumably lacked the passages wanting in all its surviving descendants, the propriety of assuming that these passages at one time formed part of the text of Servius becomes still more questionable.

The following readings are typical of a large number accepted by the editors in their combined text but which are not attested by Σ . It does not seem probable that they are Servian. (Some of these readings are printed in italics by Thilo and some are omitted.)

- i. 18. 2: *terrarum*. This word is preceded by *locorum*, and the omission is therefore mechanically explicable. To take it as an S reading, however, it must be assumed that the compiler possessed an S manuscript superior to Σ . It could easily be explained as an addition of the compiler of DS.
- i. 62. 2: [*qui olim foedales dicebantur*]. Bracketed by editors.
- i. 98. 2: *infelicem*. ANIMAM HANC is adequately elucidated by "*quae ad laborem nata est*." *Infelicem* appears to be a DS gloss.

Other words or passages not in Σ but accepted by the editors which appear to be DS glosses or additions are the following:

- i. 138. 1: *et potentem*
- i. 171. 1: *terrae*; 6, *ipsam*
- i. 252. 2: *prohibemur* (*om.* Thilo)
- i. 254. 5: *risus enim ex laetitia oritur* (*om.* Thilo)
- i. 292. 23: *si tamen fuit* (*om.* Thilo)
- i. 323. 9: *inventi frumenti* (*om.* Thilo)
- i. 388. 3: *modo*
- i. 431. 7: *vel quamdiu sol est*
- i. 524. 7 and 529. 1: *sicut dictum est*
- i. 563. 2: *advenarum* (*om.* Thilo)
- i. 569. 2: *Italia*
- ii. 13. 14: *comoedia* (*om.* Thilo)
- ii. 16. 18: *sane* (*om.* Thilo)
- ii. 20. 1: *nam praegnantis proprie est*
- ii. 32. 6: *scilicet Graecorum*
- ii. 79. 1: *vel principale*

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. xi.

- ii. 99. 5: *de nece Palamedis* (bracketed by Th.)
- ii. 102. 1: *vel mortem*
- ii. 116. 4: *cum venatur*
5: *qui ad Troiam ducebant*
9: *qui Iphigeniam Achilli iungendam finge-*
bat
- ii. 443. 2: *id est*
- ii. 488. 1: *physicos*
- ii. 686. 1: *religiosos*
- ii. 798. 1: *alii*

The following seem to be additions made to the text of S by the compiler in the course of incorporating material from the non-Servian commentary:

- ii. 54. 5: *sane om.* Σ. Here the combined DS-S text resumes with this word after the insertion of a non-Servian scholium. If we disregard this scholium, *sane* becomes otiose.
- ii. 595. 1: *aut om.* Σ. This *aut* is, in the combined text as it now stands, correlative to the *aut* which begins a DS scholium two lines below. Without the DS *aut* this one is unjustifiable.
- ii. 794. 3: *plurali* and *superlativus om.* Σ Thilo. *plurali* is appropriate only to the DS reading *sonnorum* (emended from *somno* by the editors, certainly with reason). *superlativus* is possible with the S reading as it now stands, but not necessary. After inserting *pro somnorum* (794. 2), DS added *plurali* to make the subsequent comment applicable to the plural *sonnorum*.

When DS and S offer readings which appear to be of equal merit, the S reading is consistently relegated to the *apparatus*:

- i. 4. 22: *posita*] *ponimus* Σ
23: *formata*] *formamus* Σ
- i. 450. 3: *abusive*] *sic* Σ
- i. 461. 3; 535. 35; 589. 2 *et saepe: dictum est*
dicimus Σ¹⁴
- ii. 15. 2: *ut*] *sicut* Σ
- ii. 90. 2: *per blanditias*] *blandiendo* Σ
- ii. 541. 6: *dicitur duce Mercurio Priamus*] *d.P.d.M.*
Σ
- ii. 550. 3: *speraverat*] *sperabat* Σ

Since Thilo systematically accepted Σ rather than DS readings, the editors regularly omit reference to Thilo when they reject Σ readings adopted by Thilo. Occasionally, a

¹⁴ Cf. Barwick: "... So werden wir annehmen dürfen, dass der Verfasser des anonymen Kommentars sich bei Verweisungen ebenso wie S, der persönlichen Ausdrucksweise bedient hat und dass diese im Laufe der Zeit in die unpersönliche umgewandelt wurde ..." (*op. cit.*, p. 141).

slight inconsistency appears in this respect, e.g. (S *apparatus* to ii. 48. 3) *autem om.* Thilo and (ii. 48. 10) *ait genere* Σ Thilo.

In numerous instances the text has been felicitously emended, particularly in the case of passages found only in DS. Typical illustrations are to be found at i. 8. 17; i. 25. 4 (text believed corrupt by Thilo shown to be sound); i. 37. 20; i. 58. 6; i. 148. 2; i. 349. 2; ii. 599. 2; ii. 657. 11. All save i. 148. 2 concern the text of DS. In passages still marked as *loci desperati*, helpful and often tempting conjectures are supplied in the *apparatus*: sometimes in addition to the conjectures of the editors those of other contemporary scholars¹⁵ who have brought their specialized knowledge to bear on especially baffling *crucis* are given. Noteworthy, among others, are those at i. 2. 28; i. 595. 2; ii. 93. 4; ii. 725. 8.

The number of *testimonia* cited by Thilo has been considerably increased, notably from the *Glossaria*. References have been revised to conform with texts which are at present standard. The identifying numerals added by Thilo to citations from other parts of Virgil have been increased in number and in at least one case (ii. 64. 8, where ix. 634 replaces Thilo's ix. 631) corrected.

In the DS *apparatus* at ii. 657. 11, following the entry "*Ascaniumque* Ascanium *codd.* Verg. et pleraeque *edd.*," the editors ask: "*sed Ascaniumque cur non legendum?*" Perhaps the answer may be found by reading the previous verse in conjunction with the one (ii. 666) in question:

eripis, ut mediis hostem in penetralibus utque
Ascanium patremque meum iuxtaque Creusam

The typography of the volume is virtually flawless, and the proof has been corrected with exemplary accuracy. The only typographical slip noticed occurs in the S *apparatus*, where the numeral preceding the variant concerning ii. 51. 7 should be printed **51. 7** (with only the first two digits in boldfaced type).

The following misprints have been found: *Praefatio*, p. iii, n. 1, l. 6.—*For* 159 *read* 169. DS *apparatus* to i. 22. 5.—*For* ΑΙΗΙΤΙΑ (C, Thilo) *read* ΑΙΗΙΤΙΑ (Thilo) (Thilo cites the reading of C as ΑΙΗΙΤΙΑ).

¹⁵ Professors A. D. Nock, A. S. Pease, and J. Whatmough.

S *apparatus* to ii. 116. 9.—For *fingebant* read *fingebat*.

S *apparatus* to ii. 485. 2.—For *virtus om.* Σ read *virtus om. σ*.

On the page preceding the *Praefatio* the editors have placed a moving tribute to their senior colleague, who died just before this volume, the first to appear of the great project, in the inception and prosecution of which he played so important a part, went to the press. It and the volumes to come will form a fitting monument to his memory.

RICHARD T. BRUÈRE

University of Chicago

Platons Akademie. By HANS HERTER. ("Bonner Universitätschriften," No. 4.) Bonn: Verlag Hans Scheur, 1946. Pp. 40.

This exposition in its main features of form and content follows the traditional pattern for the treatment of this subject. It is pleasantly fluent and culminates in an edifying peroration, exhorting all modern universities to be true to the spirit of that institution which, according to Herter, is their common ancestor; but as an account of the nature of the Academy and of Plato's teaching it cannot be said to be an improvement upon the highly fictional or enthusiastically conjectural expositions which on account of the very number and the professional dignity of the authors have during the last hundred years come to be widely accepted as a satisfactory substitute for historical evidence.

Herter begins his essay with a description of the location and the physical characteristics of the Academy, in the founding of which he believes Plato to have been strongly influenced by Pythagorean example, although, in any case, his antipathy to Antisthenes, who had already begun to teach in the gymnasium of Cynosarges, must have impelled him to come forward in opposition.¹ The location of the

Academy gives Herter the occasion to contrast Plato's love of rural quiet and Socrates' preference for life in the city. As evidence for this attitude of Socrates he cites *Phaedrus* 230 D; but, after all, it was Plato who wrote this passage, and there is no reason to suppose that it expresses his own feeling any less than does 230 B-C, the description of the charm of the countryside which he puts into Socrates' mouth. It would be more to the point to observe from passages like this that Plato had "two sides to his head."

After characterizing the organization as a *thiasos* of the Muses, speaking of its "symposia" and referring to the anecdotes which tell how Plato's writings drew pupils to him from far and wide, Herter outlines the daily routine of the school, for which he has really no evidence at all. The passage in *Academiorum index*, col. VII, ll. 41 ff. (pp. 41-42 [Mekler]) does not support the statement that the Academy under Plato began the day's work with a sacrifice to the Muses; it does not say at what time of day the sacrifice which Xenocrates omitted was ordinarily offered or even that it was offered daily. It seems even more unjustifiable to take what Aulus Gellius (xx. 5) says of the practice of Aristotle as evidence that in Plato's Academy the more difficult lectures were held in the morning and the easier ones in the afternoon. The passage in question is not unexceptionable evidence even for Aristotle, for its purpose is to explain the distinction of *ἐξωτερικά* and *ἑκπαιδευτικά* in the writings of Aristotle, and the use of the spurious correspondence between Alexander and Aristotle on this point infects the whole passage.

Herter imagines that in the dialogues themselves he can discern the change of Plato's pedagogical method from colloquy to lecture; and he appeals, of course, to the tradition of

that Plato pursued or studied philosophy, not that he taught or lectured. (The ultimate source of the statement of Alexander is, of course, Arist. *Met.* A 6 [cf. Diog. Laert. iii. 8]; and Diels's conjecture of 'Ἡρακλείδων for 'Ἡράκλειτον [Doz. Gr., p. 150, n. 2] is therefore unnecessary. It is far more probable that the words ἐν Ἀκαδημίᾳ εἶτα ἐν τῷ κήπῳ τῷ παρὰ τὸν Κολωνίον were interpolated by Diogenes from another source and context [cf. Wilamowitz, *Platon*, II, 2].)

¹ On the strength of Diog. Laert. iii. 5, Herter says (p. 7 and note to p. 7, l. 30) that Plato first taught in the gymnasium; but the whole context shows that Diogenes understood the statement of Alexander Polyhistor to refer to the time before Plato had met Socrates; and, if Alexander really wrote *ἐφίλοσοφε* . . . καὶ "Ἡράκλειτον," Diogenes' interpretation of the statement must be correct, and *ἐφίλοσοφε* would mean

the lecture on the Good as evidence that this change really did occur. Here a slight novelty of interpretation is introduced, for Herter not only denies, as others have done also, that the lecture on the Good could have been open to the public but also says that Plato must have intended it to be an "introduction for beginners." Now Aristoxenus certainly understood Aristotle to have meant that it was a public lecture; but, public or not, it would have been a strange "Einführung der Neulinge," which, according to all accounts, Aristotle, Speusippus, Xenocrates, and such members of the Academy attended and found enigmatic.²

From what is reported of this lecture and from the *Meno*, the *Republic*, and the *Laws*, Herter concludes that the course of instruction in the Academy must have begun with mathematics and that the mathematical studies must have been followed by instruction and training in dialectic; but he says nothing of the fact that in the *Republic* the study of dialectic is expressly postponed until the age of thirty and that, even then, between thirty and thirty-five it is dialectic as an exercise in abstract thinking that is prescribed rather than the highest philosophy, the study of philosophy being postponed until the age of fifty.³ Herter, however, believes that dialectic in the curriculum of the Academy was not merely formal but was concerned with ethical content, i.e., was a search for the idea of Good, and that the revelation of the world of ideas in the light of the idea of Good was the final purpose of the course of instruction. He goes on to say that the theory of ideas implies the attempt to make the phenomenal world approximate more nearly the ideal world and so leads to concern with practical politics. Plato, he believes, wanted to educate in his school young men who could reform the world according to his political ideals; but the failure of the attempt in Sicily meant that for the future the Academy was to be significant not as a political association but as a scientific institute.

The rest of the essay is concerned with the turn given to the theory of ideas which, Herter

says, was decisive for the character of the Academy and of all the institutions derived from it. This decisive turn one might have expected to be the notorious identification of ideas and numbers. Herter does assume that Plato reduced all the ideas to numbers and even asserts that this identification occurred much earlier than is ordinarily supposed, since the influence of the Pythagoreans which Plato underwent during his early travels must, he thinks, have been responsible for it; but he does not explain why there is then no mention of such a doctrine in Plato's writings,⁴ nor does he take any notice of the conflicting evidence concerning the idea-numbers or of the difficulties involved in ascribing to Plato any such doctrine at all. The idea-numbers, however, detain him only briefly; it is not this doctrine but the method of diaeresis that he makes the decisive factor in the development of Plato's dialectic, for it was by means of this method, he says, that Plato tried at once to bridge the gap between the ideal and the phenomenal world and to develop the "organization" of the world of ideas. Yet what he says in the text about the "bridging of the gap" he effectively retracts in his notes: "An essential transition from the ideas to the phenomena is naturally excluded now as before; Plato adheres to the division of the two domains and remains a dualist as he was" (p. 37: note on p. 22, l. 24). As diaeresis was not meant to "bridge this gap," however, so Plato never meant it to produce an ontological map of the world of ideas. Herter cites *Sophist* 235 C as proof of the "Vollständigkeitsanspruch des diaeretischen Verfahrens," by which he means that, when diaeresis was properly performed, "die Ideenwelt war in ihrem Gesamtbestande erfasst." This passage makes no such claim, however; it says only that diaeresis is a sure heuristic method, a way of making the search for any single *γένος* exhaustive. *Politicus* 265 A and 266 E by themselves show clearly enough that

⁴ Herter uses in lieu of evidence for the idea-numbers in the dialogues a fantastic *argumentum e silentio*: he would explain what he calls Plato's "restraint" concerning the objects of the two activities, dialectic and mathematics, in *Republic* 510 B ff. as an indication that Plato already envisaged the ideas as "geometrical-arithmetical entities" (pp. 35-36: note on p. 20, l. 31).

² Cf. Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Early Academy* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1945), p. 12, and nn. 56-60 (p. 90) with references.

³ *Ibid.*, pp. 68-70.

Plato did not see in the diaeretical process a full reproduction of the world of ideas, for he says there that longer and shorter forms of the procedure can give the same result.⁵

Herter lays the usual stress upon the fragment of Epicrates and the anecdote in Diogenes Laertius vi. 40 in order to argue the importance of diaeresis in the Academy and concludes that such activity encouraged investigation in the natural sciences. Speusippus' "Ομοια appears to him to support this conjecture; but no notice is taken of the fact that Speusippus had a conception of diaeresis entirely different from Plato's and that his epistemological theory as distinguished from Plato's required him to attempt an *exhaustive* classification of all entities.⁶ Herter's reconstruction of the Academy is admittedly a replica of Usener's: the members were engaged together in a single great program of research, though advanced students, like "Privatdozenten" or "teaching assistants," were intrusted with their own courses within the general framework; and here they laid the foundation of that systematization of the sciences of which Aristotle's work was the continuation, although Aristotle could not maintain the unity of all the disciplines in their common relation to the Good that was the essence of the Academic conception of the universe. This is a picture to arouse the enthusiasm of the modern academician; but that is not reason enough for accepting it as a historically correct likeness of Plato's Academy.

HAROLD CHERNISS

University of California, Berkeley

The Greek Anthology in France and in the Latin Writers of the Netherlands to the Year 1800.

By JAMES HUTTON. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1946. Pp. xiv+822. \$5.00.

This work parallels the author's earlier volume, *The Greek Anthology in Italy to the Year 1800* (Ithaca, 1935), and extends to another geographical area his intensive study of the evolution in modern European literature of the

literary form, the varied motifs, and the delicate art of the Greek epigrams. Like its predecessor, the present book consists of three parts: an introductory essay (pp. 1-78), which surveys synoptically the history and reputation of the Anthology within the limits defined in the title; a series of articles (pp. 79-588) which normally take the form of a concise biographical sketch of each writer, an enumeration of his principal works, an estimate of the extent of his acquaintance with the Anthology, and a detailed account of his use of it, supplemented on occasion by specimens of his translations or imitations and, when necessary, by identification of the other translations or imitations known to him; and a register (pp. 589-806) which gives for each epigram in the Anthology a list of the writers who used it, the *incipit* of each version or derivative, and the necessary bibliographic references.

The strangest chapter in the history of the Anthology in France is the eclipse of its reputation from the middle of the seventeenth century to the last part of the eighteenth: its prestige declined so far that the phrase *épigramme à la grecque* could be used by the lepidopteran wits of the time as a synonym for insipidity. Although this was in part a consequence of the Baroque predilection for satire and sharply pointed epigrams, it was also, as Hutton points out, partly the result of ignorance, for there was a synchronous decline in the study of Greek, which lapsed so far that a pessimist could at one time predict that within thirty years no Frenchman would be able to read the language. It is indeed curious that even in the *grand siècle* the locusts of educational theory had already made their appearance and, while gaily chewing the yet ungarnered harvests of the Renaissance, chirruped forth their discovery that Greek was not "useful" and did not minister to the putative "needs of a changing world." But the prevalence, or at least the efficacy, of this perennial sciolism must, in turn, be related to a general vitiation of taste and judgment, attested, for example, by the fashionable coteries who, around 1670, lauded the fatuous *Pucelle* of Chapelain as a suitable substitute for Homer¹ and affected to disdain a

⁵ Cf. Cherniss, *Aristotle's Criticism of Plato and the Academy*, I (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1944), 46-47.

⁶ Cf. Cherniss, *The Riddle of the Early Academy*, pp. 37-43.

¹ See the tenth *Satire* of Boileau with its description of the "docte demeure" où l'on "rit des vains amateurs du grec et du latin."

learning which they had not the diligence to acquire. Even the brilliant achievements of rationalism which close the age were not without their effect, for they excited by induction the pathetic intellectual arrogance and naïve faith in "modern" science and social progress that animated the motley caravan of world-improvers as it began its march to the guillotines of the next century.

The listing of writers who used the Anthology appears to be well-nigh exhaustive. More eloquent, perhaps, than any praise in general terms of the author's thoroughness and accuracy will be the avowal that a reviewer who has queried and checked some four hundred details can signal no omission or inaccuracy more significant than the following: (1) A type of interest in the Anthology to which Hutton does not advert is best represented by the celebrated Abbé d'Hancarville, who, in his anonymous *Monumens de la vie privée des douze Césars*, quotes Latin, and supplies French, translations of eight epigrams: *AP* v. 97, 166, 267 (ll. 9-10 only), 297; xi. 220, 221, 225, 272.² The Latin translations, with the exception of Ausonius' version of xi. 225, come from a source which I cannot identify and are not listed in Hutton's registers. They are mediocre and sometimes incorrect; the translator of xi. 221 completely missed the point. (2) Spanheim's use of the Anthology in his *Observationes in Callimachum* is understated, for Hutton lists (p. 268) only eight epigrams as a "summary of his quotations and references." In the 758 pages of this commentary I find eighty-four references to (as nearly as I can judge) about seventy epigrams, excluding those of Callimachus himself, but the majority of these references are merely to a phrase or a line. The only item of any importance at all which Hutton did not record is the fact that Spanheim seems to have been the first to publish and translate the following lines from epigrams in the Palatine recension: vi. 237. 1-2; xii. 8. 8 and 131. 1-2; xiv. 53. 1-2.³ (3) It might have

been noted (p. 176) that the Latin versions "contained" in Bourdelot's edition of Heliodorus are presumably the work of Stanisław Warszewicki, and the translation of ix. 485 should not have been catalogued as prose; it will scan as a series of pentameter lines, if one allows for the false quantity of the equally false dative *Pēlēō*, which may be a misprint for *Pēlēi*.⁴ (4) *Epimenides* is the title of the second edition of Lomeier's work (p. 269); the first (Ultraieci, 1681) was simply entitled *De veterum gentilium lustrationibus syntagma*. (5) The humanist Teocreno, writing an epigram on Germanicus Caesar's Latin epigram, "De puero glacie perempto," uses the phrase *Graio carmine*, which Hutton (p. 308) describes as "puzzling, since neither of the Greek versions [of the epigram] are ascribed to Germanicus." But the "De puero" is one of a pair of Latin epigrams by Germanicus; the other, "Ad Hectoris tumulum," also has a Greek equivalent in the Anthology (ix. 387), and for this Greek version Germanicus' name is given in the superscription. Teocreno reasoned, not implausibly, that, if Germanicus wrote one of his epigrams in both languages, he also produced both the Greek and the Latin versions of the other epigram and that the superscription in the Anthology which attributes the Greek form of the "De puero" to "Flaccus" must be a mistake.⁵ But it is almost an impertinence to mention such *quisquiliæ*⁶ in criticism of a work which, if I have counted correctly, describes the use of the Anthology by 323 authors (including those discussed in footnotes but excluding those treated more fully in *The Anthology in Italy*) and lists approximately 10,670 translations and imitations of Greek epigrams.

644. There is also a quotation (p. 133) from v. 255, which had already been published by Heinsius (Hutton, p. 258). In Hutton's register the entry for Spanheim under xii. 159, should read "vv. 3-6."

⁴ I should be more confident that the error was merely typographical had not Warszewicki's Greek failed him in line 5 and his Latin in line 6.

⁵ The assumption was the more natural in an age in which polyglot composition was regularly practiced; a little later, for example, Dorat wrote Latin, French and Greek versions of his *Paeanes*.

⁶ There are a very few typographical errors and almost none that will occasion any difficulty; p. 72, read *perdit jadis* *ca* cause, unless a rather silly *calembour* was intended by the anonymous writer; p. 137, n. 18, read *potuit*; p. 285, n. 14, read *δαμνέμενος* for *δυνάμενος*.

² In the edition of 1782, published "A Caprée, Chez Sabellius," the epigrams are quoted respectively on pp. 200, 159, 200, 207, 90, 103, 151. If I recall correctly, Mirabeau's *Erotica* [sic] *biblioth.*, of which I do not have a copy at hand, also refers to the Anthology.

³ In the edition published at Utrecht in 1697 the quotations occur, respectively, on pp. 528, 512, 338,

The strange vicissitudes of the text of the Anthology have made its modern *Überlieferungsgeschichte* so complex⁷ that it is no exaggeration to say that Hutton's two volumes have, for the first time, made it possible to know how much of the Anthology was at any given time available either to scholars or to general readers; the principal lines of its influence are even more complex, for books of selections (often schoolbooks) were more widely disseminated than editions of the whole, and the Greek models, generally speaking, reached the vernacular writers through one or more Latin intermediaries, while there were constant cross-currents, which Hutton has also charted with clarity and sagacity. His two admirable volumes are, according to the Preface, the precursors of a similar study of the Anthology in England, and presumably the remaining Neo-Latin writers will be somewhere fitted into the scheme. We shall thus have a full history of the Anthology to the age of romanticism in four principal modern literatures: the English, the French, the Italian, and the International, or Latin. This undertaking is not only the most comprehensive investigation of the persistence of a classical influence in modern letters; it is a work of which American scholarship may well be proud.

REVILO P. OLIVER

University of Illinois

⁷ The Anthology in the form in which we know it was first published in 1813-17. The *editio princeps* of 1494 gave only the Planudean recension, which differs radically in arrangement and lacks some twelve hundred epigrams. The contents of the Palatine manuscript, discovered by Salmassius at the end of 1606, were first edited in 1772-76; but manuscript copies and excerpts enjoyed a limited circulation during the intervening hundred and seventy years; and many epigrams were published singly or in small groups in commentaries, *syntagmata*, books of selections, collections of Latin verse, etc. Furthermore, some Palatine epigrams somehow found their way into print before 1606, and many epigrams have an independent tradition, since they are quoted by classical writers, e.g., Diogenes Laërtius. One must also take account of the multiple Latin translations, some of them ancient (e.g., by Ausonius), and many of them scattered through the works of hundreds of Neo-Latin poets. Even the finest extensive translation ever made from the Anthology, Grotius' virtually complete version of the Palatine recension, although completed in 1631, was not published as a whole until 1795-98, but excerpts from it found their way into print from time to time during the interval.

Philosophy and Medicine in Ancient Greece: With an Edition of Περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἱερτικῆς By W. H. S. JONES. (Supplements to the *Bulletin of the History of Medicine*, No. 8). Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1946. Pp. vi+100. \$2.00.

In spite of the meticulous editing of the text of *Περὶ ἀρχαῖς ἱερτικῆς*, the strength and value of this book lie in its subjectivity. That is as it should be; a text can be prepared by a combination of ingenuity, assiduity, and an objective knowledge of language; but the field of ancient medicine calls for the mature wisdom of such scholars as Dr. Jones, if both the scientific and the humanistic significance of the work is to be understood.

The monograph has been divided into three sections: (I) "The Pre-Hippocratics and Plato"; (IIa) "Hypotheses in Greek Thought," (b) "Philosophy and Medical Etiquette"; (III) "*Ancient Medicine*." The first two sections are developed in a manner to challenge and pique the interest of the classicist, who constantly finds the authors whom he has known in their literary associations subjected to the probing and the censure of the scientist. Thus, in the examination of hypotheses in Greek thought, Plato comes in for some sharp criticism because he worked as a philosopher rather than as a scientist and with persuasive logic set up hypotheses as the best available substitute for *τὰ ὄντα*, undisturbed by any reflection that a perfect theory could be demolished by one as yet unascertained fact (pp. 29 f.). Or, again, he is charged with having failed to test hypothesis by an appeal to phenomena or having confused exact and experimental science or having exercised a mental tyranny which prevented Aristotle from pursuing his logical line of thought to the establishment of a thorough inductive method (p. 30). So also familiar names assume a new relative importance when, for instance, Alcmaeon is credited with the development of a theory of knowledge to which Plato and Aristotle were indebted, even though he was mistaken in his application of it. *Ancient Medicine* is, in fact, largely interpreted as a defense of Alcmaeon's theory (pp. 4 f.).

There is an element of subjectivity about

these observations that apparently claimed the attention of the writers of Greece, as well as of more modern times. The high place accorded to Empedocles, who saw the future of chemical and medical studies as dependent on something more than the observation of morbid phenomena, comes as a mild surprise to those who have been disposed to dismiss his grandiose conceits as the extravagances of madness (pp. 11 f.). Nevertheless, Jones's generous acceptance of Empedocles' point of view does not entirely convince; and many a classicist will continue to read with a jaundiced eye the famous prediction of scientific progress on which it is based.

The tendency of modern academicians to find identity of aim and method in science and the humanities is checked with sympathetic, but discerning, judgment by the author. The two may subserve each other, but there are important differences: the one represents the instinct to create, the other to collect and classify. Philosophy begins later in human history and reaches its maturity in a fraction of the time required by science. The three centuries which separate Aristotle from Thales witnessed a development in philosophy which it has taken science three thousand years to equal. Philosophy can soar on the wings of an opulent fancy; science is forever restrained by the obstinate intransigency of facts. It is precisely for this reason that the segment of scientific knowledge represented by medical studies in Greece assumes major importance (pp. 28 f.).

While Jones has advanced ideas that are sometimes at variance with the received classical tradition, he has, in general, followed a logical and painstaking path of reasoning that commands respect. He pays tribute to Edelstein's excellent study of the *Oath* but cautiously refrains from indorsing the claim of Pythagorean origin (pp. 36 f., 44). One might take exception to some of the conclusions in the discussion of the work *Sevens*; for instance, the rejection of evidence through translations seems somewhat arbitrary (p. 7), while the argument for a sixth-century date, based on chapter xi, is far from conclusive (p. 9). It hinges on a description of the earth in seven

parts which constitute a map superimposed on the human body, the head and face being represented by the Peloponnesus, and so forth. The omission of Athens and Delphi from this fanciful map, on which Jones bases his conclusion, could be accounted for by a variety of considerations other than the relative importance of the sites—interpolation, national prejudice, even stupidity. Aeschylus in the fifth century did not hesitate to change the locale of the *Oresteia* from Mycenae to Argos because of local and contemporary prejudice. Jones argues logically, but his argument pertains to a passage that has little logic in it, and it is questionable whether such a paragraph should be weighed so strongly as to carry the day for a sixth-century date when all other evidence suggests the fourth.

In passing, Jones is to be commended for emphasizing the theory so clearly enunciated in *Sevens*, which controlled medical education in Greece and which is only now gaining favor anew, namely, the recognition of man as a part of the natural world (p. 8). Humanistic studies have insensibly beclouded that identity, with the result that so versatile a scholar as Professor Whitehead found it necessary to protest against the false dichotomy which contemplates man *and* nature rather than man *in* nature. In this connection it is worth noting that the capacity of the ancient physician for accurate observation is called into question and accounted for by an appeal to temperament. Perhaps one should add the lack of equipment for the performance of experiments and the indifference to its acquisition.

It is clear that the sympathy of the writer lies with the medical writers, and it is in his sections on the Hippocratic corpus and similar documents that one feels the strength of his scholarship. When he points out the dangers of speculation and rhetoric in a scientific work, one appreciates the restraining force of precision which leavened the brilliance of the philosophers in the classical period, even though in the natural course of events it is the latter who have claimed the major place in modern thought. Yet it was perhaps the consummate skill of Plato as much as inherent merit that gave philosophy its pre-eminent position.

The critical text, translation, and commentary on *Ancient Medicine* together constitute approximately one-half the monograph. The *apparatus criticus* is prepared with references by lines as they occur in this edition, a fact which will inevitably cause some difficulty in correlating the results with the work of other scholars. Yet the range is limited, and perhaps no other decision was practicable. More questionable is the inclusion of the subjective and reflective notes, often based on disputed readings, after each chapter in translation.

The typography and arrangement have been skilfully handled, in view of the successive sections of introductory and expository material, text, translation, and additional notes, each accompanied with its own complement of footnotes. Only one serious error has come to my notice, a curious jumbling and repetition in notes 15 and 16 on page 5.

HERBERT N. COUCH

Brown University

Nomos und Physis: Herkunft und Bedeutung einer Antithese im griechischen Denken des 5. Jahrhunderts. By FELIX HEINIMANN. (Basel dissertation.) Basel: F. Reinhardt, 1945. Pp. 221. Sw. Fr. 9.50.

As scholarly work in the conquered and the occupied countries of Europe has fallen off, at least temporarily, it is encouraging to find good work coming from the neutral countries. A new Swiss series, "Schweizerische Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft," which appears to invite contributions from non-Swiss sources, is inaugurated by a solid yet readable discussion of the well-known antithesis, *nomos-physis*. Most of the material is familiar but bears being presented anew in this convenient form; it does not pretend to be an exhaustive collection. The chief merit of the dissertation is its broad sweep and judicious organization. Heinimann sees his subject as a part of the general phenomenon of antithetical thinking; he does not limit himself to the terms *nomos-physis* but deals also with their cognates and with certain synonyms.

An introductory chapter sketches the background of the subject in Greek ethnographical

writings, including the earlier Hippocratic writings and Herodotus. A second chapter deals with such precursors of the particular sophistic antithesis under discussion as appearance-reality (*δόξα-ἀλήθεια*, *λόγος-ἔργον*, *ὄνομα-ἔργον*). Two parallel sections of special interest trace the several fortunes of *nomos* and of *physis* and their cognates, showing how, after many vicissitudes, the one came to be used often as the antonym of "truth" (p. 89), the other as the antonym of "appearance" (p. 108). Both terms are still sometimes ambiguous (*nomos*, both mere "opinion" and "law"; *physis*, both "origin," as in Empedocles B 8 [Diels], and true "nature," *Ajax* 1259 preserving both meanings).

Now it was only a question of time how soon the two terms were to be brought into mutual contrast. If the *polis* held to *nomos* as its bulwark against barbarians, the rationalizing scientist inclined toward the sanction of *physis*. Doxographic tradition makes either Archelaus or Hippias the first to set the two terms in sharp opposition in the ethical field and to use them in the dative (which becomes standard use). As I have suggested elsewhere and as Heinimann independently states, the question of priority cannot be settled. Perhaps we may regard Archelaus as a transitional figure on the way to Protagoras and the doctrine of *homo mensura*; but, since Protagoras emphasizes the relativity of *nomos* and cannot appeal to *physis*, there can be no antithesis for him. Even on the stage the antithesis is slow in making its appearance.

Though natural law (*physis*, or *ἀνάγκη* [sc. *φύσεως*]) is implicitly opposed to *nomos* by medical writers and by Euripides, Heinimann thinks it must have been some Sophist who first brought *nomos* and *physis* into sharp juxtaposition; he finds the earliest trace of it in *Clouds* 1075 ff., for Euripides, Frag. 920, must be dated later and the chronology and the exact language of Hippias remain doubtful. But the more extended and significant and, as I believe, still earlier exposition of the antithesis he rightly finds in the papyrus fragments of Antiphon's *On Truth*. Here *ἀνάγκη φύσεως* is both cosmic and human and serves as the basis of the naturalistic ethics of *physis* and

τὸ *ἔμφερρον*, while the *nomoi* are criticized not so much as being opposed to *physis* as because they are superfluous if a real sanction is recognized in *physis* and τὸ *ἔμφερρον*. But the fetters even of *physis* may be painful, for *physis* and man may have different *ἔμφεροντα*. Heinimann inclines to the view that Antiphon's conception of *nomos-physis* may come ultimately from the Eleatic δόξα-ἀλήθεια, though it was made possible only by Ionian nature-philosophy and medicine. He considers briefly the relation of Antiphon's ideas to the *Clouds* (*Adikos Logos*), to Calicles in Plato's *Gorgias*, and to *Rep.* i-ii, with their varying degrees of utilitarianism. (He should have noted that Thrasymachus in *Rep.* i does not appeal to *physis*, though Glaucon in *Rep.* ii does appeal to it.)

Three useful sections deal with the applications of the antithesis. As to theories of the genesis of culture, a common sophistic notion opposes to Hesiod's pessimism and picture of degeneration an idea of progress from animal behavior to civilization; Protagoras and Pseudo-Demosthenes 25 differ, in distinguishing man from the animals and in stressing *nomos*. As to the theory of knowledge, Antiphon under Eleatic influence sets up *nomos-physis* as a parallel to δόξα-ἀλήθεια, but without formally identifying the two antitheses; the identification is, however, accomplished in the fourth century, especially by the later writers of the Hippocratic corpus. And as to the philosophy of language, the old problem of "words" and "things" is reduced to the antithesis *nomos-physis*, again chiefly under the influence of medical writers. (Plato's *Cratylus* perhaps should receive more credit here.)

A few pages illustrate the breakdown of the antithesis by examining three typical passages. In Thuc. vi. 16. 2, *nomos* is political, while *physis* is psychological. In Eur. *Bacch.* 890-96, the chorus defends the *nomoi* as rooted in *physis*; E. R. Dodds (*ad loc.*) appositely cites Plato *Laws* 890 d and Anon. Iamblichus for *nomos* founded on *physis*, to which should be added *Gorg.* 483 e and *Tim.* 83 e, the former of which A. E. Taylor (*Plato: The Man and His Work* [New York: Dial Press, 1936], p. 117, n. 1) finds "the first occurrence . . . in extant

literature, of the ominous phrase 'law of nature'"; Heinimann, comparing with *Bacch.* the far from ominous ἀγραφοὶ νόμοι of Soph. *Ant.* and *OT*, does not regard the νόμος τῆς φύσεως of *Gorg.* 483 e as original with Plato. At any rate, it is now a current idea. Finally, in Eur. *Ion* 642 ff., *nomos* and *physis* are not antithetical but complementary.

An appendix deals with the dating of the Hippocratic *On Airs, Waters, Places* and *On the Sacred Disease*. Heinimann finds no help in Herodotus for dating either treatise, but rather a common source for both. Internal evidence, however, indicates separate authorship for the two works; the former betrays no sophistic influence in content or style, while the latter shows some traces. The conclusion is that the former may be contemporary with Herodotus and Pseudo-Xen. *Pol. Ath.*, while the latter may be a decade or two later.

The Bibliography indicates a fairly good acquaintance with the modern literature on the subject, though not with certain important studies (e.g., works not in German by Chiapelli, Burnet, Huit, Lovejoy, Heidel, and Beardslee, not to mention works in German, such as those of Joel, Menzel, and Eckstein). No doubt some of these and other works were inaccessible to the author, who therefore deserves the more credit for results achieved independently, even if they often merely corroborate conclusions already drawn. Though not a complete study, this is one of the clearest and best-balanced studies of its subject.

WILLIAM C. GREENE

Harvard University

Greek Prefix Studies: On the Use of Adjective Particles. By REINHOLD STRÖMBERG. Göteborg: Wettergren & Kerbers Förlag, 1946. Pp. 204. Kr. 20.

This monograph is apparently the first work in English by an author who is already well known for a series of German works dealing with Greek scientific terminology, of which a list appears on the back cover of the present work. Certain lapses of idiom suggest that Strömberg is more at home in German than in

English, but these are not of such a nature as to make reading difficult.

Compound adjectives having *ἀπο-*, *ἐκ-*, *ἐν-*, or *ἐπι-* as first member have been made the subject of study, partly because of features which render them especially suitable and partly because certain other prefixes, such as *κατα-*, *μετα-*, *παρα-*, *συν-*, and *ὕπο-*, have already been treated in other works. The plan here does not, of course, call for a discussion of all adjectives with the prefixes *ἀπο-*, *ἐκ-*, *ἐν-*, and *ἐπι-*. The schematic method of classification has been avoided, and a number of more or less frequent compound adjectives (e.g., *ἀπότροπος*, *ἐδικος*, *ἐκλιπής*, *ἐξεδρος*, *ἐναγώνιος*, *ἐνάμιλλος*, *ἐνδοξος*, *ἐνεργός*, *ἐπίβουλος*, *ἐπίγονος*, and *ἐπιμαχος*) are nowhere mentioned; but from those adjectives selected for special discussion, exceeding one hundred in number, certain standards of usage are set up regarding the functions of the prefixes.

Adjectives in which the relation of the prefix to the second member is that of a preposition to its object are designated "hypostatizing compounds," a term somewhat unfamiliar but based on usage adopted in Schwyzler's *Griechische Grammatik* (p. 436). Clear examples of this type include such adjectives as *ἐκτοπος*, *ἐφέσπερος*, *ἐγκέφαλος*, together with some extended terms in *-ιος*, as *ἀποθύμιος*, *ἐπιδήμιος*. The second of Strömberg's major classes is the *bahwrīhi* type, where the relation of the prefix to the second member is similar to that of a predicate to its subject. Among clear examples not capable of being otherwise analyzed we may cite *ἐξόφθαλμος*, *ἐπήρετος*, "equipped with oars," and *ἐντεκνος*; but there is a borderland in which hypostatizing and *bahwrīhi* compounds cannot easily be distinguished. This is especially true of *ἀπο*-compounds, where mutual separation of two persons or things is involved. Schwyzler (p. 435) treats *ἀπόσιτος* as a *bahwrīhi* (for which he uses the term *exozentrisch*), but Strömberg derives it from the phrase *ἀπὸ τοῦ σίτου*. In fact, his tendency is to give the *bahwrīhi* type of compound adjective a reduced range, and he recognizes no compounds of this type with *ἀπο-* as first member. For some apparent examples he finds other explanations: for ex-

ample, *ἀπεχθής* and *ἀπόκοιτος* are taken as back-formations from *ἀπεχθάνεσθαι* and *ἀποκοιτεῖν*, respectively. *ἐκδιψος* is similarly explained, but we must consider the possibility of analyzing it as a *bahwrīhi*, formed perhaps after the analogy of *ἐκθυμος* or others of its type, where the force of *ἐκ-* is similar. A more complex process of derivation than back-formation is the type of contamination in which an adjective stem is compounded with a prefix under the influence of some verb whose prefix has the same function. *ἀπόδικος*, "pronounced not guilty," is one example, since it cannot be a back-formation from the semantically dissimilar *ἀποδικεῖν*; and other examples are shown in the subject index under "Contamination"; but in some cases the adjective can be equally well analyzed as a back-formation: *πλέως* : *πιμπλάναι* :: *X* : *ἐπιπιμπλάναι* (see p. 91, where the explanation offered really involves back-formation). The choice is often difficult to make, and comparison between related words in regard to age is not a safe method, because either one may be older than its first recorded appearance would seem to indicate. This fact is recognized in principle (p. 20) but sometimes ignored in special instances. Observe, for example, the treatment of *καταριγηλός* on page 139; *ρίγηλός* and *καταρριγέιν* may be equally old, though first attested much later.

Since *bahwrīhi* and hypostatizing compounds contain a substantive as second member, some explanation is needed for those compounds in which the second member is a true adjective. On page 147 attention is called to such examples as *ἀπάξιος*, where the result of composition of *ἀπο* + *άξια* is an apparent compound of *άξιος*. Obviously, however, a more important source is back-formation from verbs, a process to which Strömberg gives due recognition. Now in such cases the special force of the verbal prefix carries over when the compound adjective is formed; and this force may be local in character or may be quite colorless, but often it expresses an intensity similar to the notion of thoroughness found in some verbs as a result of composition, which is the main source of the strengthening of meaning seen in compound adjectives. A second

source is in hypostatizing compounds like *ἐκμετрос*, where the notion of excess follows logically from the basic meaning. The principle of analogy, of course, operates, and several of the prefixes came to be used for the express purpose of strengthening the meaning of adjectives. The weakening force of certain prefixes is, to a large extent, derived from their local meanings, whereby they may either indicate approximation or may represent something as having a certain color or other quality only on a part of it. The weakening function of prefixes has been especially extended in medical, botanical, and other scientific literature.

A few matters of classification, reference, etc., call for brief comment. *παράμυστος* is listed (p. 18) with adjectives in which the second member is itself a compound; it does not belong here unless we analyze it as containing *ἀ-privative*, which Strömberg surely does not intend. On page 37 in *Iliad* v. 20 read *ἀρόπουσε* for *ἀρόπουσε*. On page 66, read Polybius X 48, 7 for Polybius X 48, 3. On pages 100 (n. 1) and 123 the references to "Soph. *Τρωάδες*" should be to "Soph. *Τραχίνιαι*." On page 120, "XVIII 267" should be "XIX 267," and the references to "XVI 209; 277; 337" should be to "XVI 209; 273; XVII 337." On page 146 "Odyssey XV 488" should be "Odyssey XV 448."

Despite these few blemishes and the not infrequent traces of foreign idiom, the book marks a step forward into territory rather sparsely covered by previous investigators, and it has value both for the actual lexical material treated and for the development of methods applicable to other similar material. The word index and subject index considerably increase its usefulness.

JAMES W. POULTNEY

The Johns Hopkins University

"A propos de quelques monnaies romaines du musée Saint-Raymond," *Mémoires de la Société archéologique du Midi de la France*, XX, 1-38. By ANDRÉ AYMARD (1940).

"Remarques sur des inscriptions de Lugdunum Convenarum," *ibid.*, pp. 131-88. By A. AYMARD (1942).

"Du nouveau sur un Toulousain et sur Toulouse à l'époque romaine," *Bulletin de la Société archéologique du Midi de la France*, Troisième série, V (1942-45), 513-28. By A. AYMARD (1947).

"Remarques sur le boisement des Grands Causses dans l'antiquité," *Revue géographique des Pyrénées et du Sud-Ouest*, XII (1941), 115-28. By A. AYMARD.

"Toponymie pré-indo-européenne dans le Sud-Ouest," *ibid.*, pp. 360-72. By A. AYMARD.

"La céramique gallo-romaine de La Graufesenque," *Études régionales pour l'enseignement*, Fasc. III (1942), pp. 150-60. By A. AYMARD.

"Sur l'Histoire des Perses' de Gobineau," *Société toulousaine d'études classiques, Mélanges*, I (1946), 323-41. By A. AYMARD.

The author of these articles, formerly professor at Toulouse and now at the Sorbonne, is well known especially for his work on Hellenistic history. His articles on Gallo-Roman subjects published in periodicals not readily accessible in most of our libraries, though important, are less well known. All periodicals listed above are published by Édouard Privat, 14 rue des Arts, Toulouse.

The first article is a blend of local history and numismatics, containing an account of the eighteenth-century collector Martin de Saint-Amand of Toulouse and some of the coins which once belonged to him. Notable are two coins of Pacatianus, which came from a hoard of 40,000 or more coins found by a peasant.

The inscriptions considered in the second article are discussed by Aymard also in a pair of "Notes" in *Revue des études anciennes*, XLIII (1941), 216-39. They are short and fragmentary but involve several difficult and important points. They have been mentioned in several periodicals, and Aymard's own articles are summarized in *L'Année épigraphique*, 1945, Nos. 93 and 125-29. Hence only a few important points will be considered here. C. Julius Serenus, mentioned in several inscriptions, had served as *sacerdos Romae et Augusti*. Aymard argues convincingly that the cult involved is a municipal cult (*Mémoires*,

XX, 149 f.). Important is the suggestion that ET · AUG · Π in No. 7 probably means *sacerdoti Romae* et *Aug(usti) bis* (*ibid.*, p. 169; cf. p. 153 and n. 25), which, if correct, proves that the term of office of the *sacerdos* was short—probably a year. Serenus had also been *praefectus alae VII Phrygum*. Thus there is one more proof for the existence of this *ala*, the only numbered *ala Phrygum* known. The problem is considered in both articles, and the conclusion is reached that very likely all references to an *ala Phrygum*, with or without the number, involve the same unit. Very important is the argument that the reading *in[p]endio col[n]ci[lui]*, which had been proposed for one inscription by the original editor, is impossible (*REA*, XLIII, 229–39). The chief reason is that the treasury, though controlled by the assembly, is not the property of this body but of the commonwealth or corporate organization which it represents, as is illustrated by the *arca Galliarum*. This interpretation involves a refutation of Guiraud's view that a *concilium* in theory was not a representative assembly but a meeting of all the people of the territory involved—a view which is based on a belief in the equivalence of *concilium* and *κοινὸν*. However, as Aymard points out, *concilium* means an assembly and the Latin equivalent of *κοινὸν* in the sense of a corporate union is *commune*.

The third article, likewise, is an epigraphical study, the native of Toulouse referred to in the title being Q. Trebellius Rufus, who, after having been *flamen* of Narbonensis, served as archon at Athens some year about 85/6–94/5. The occasion for the article is the Athenian inscription published by J. H. Oliver in *Hesperia*, X (1941), 72–77, No. 32. Students of emperor worship and provincial assemblies will remember the controversy about whether Trebellius Rufus was or was not the earliest *flamen* of Narbonensis. Aymard holds that the newly published inscription proves that he was the earliest, thus agreeing on this point with Jeanne and Louis Robert (*Revue des études grecques*, LVII [1944], 203) and myself (*CP*, XXXIX [1944], 198, n. 2).

The article on the Grands Causses takes as its starting-point Érasme Loir, *L'Industrie de la résine dans les Causses à l'époque gallo-romaine* (Pharmacy Dissertation, Montpellier,

No. 278 [Nancy, 1940]), in which remains of Gallo-Roman plants for distilling pitch are described. These belong to the same period as the La Graufesenque *sigillata*. Aymard, while welcoming the descriptions, questions the author's conclusion that the Causses were more heavily wooded and more densely populated at the time. He points out that the establishments listed by Loir are located in the parts which still are wooded and is inclined to believe that the chief deforestation of Gaul belongs in the pre-Roman period.

The article on place names cannot be summarized here, and the delightful little account of the La Graufesenque pottery need not be. The latter, as well as other articles in the fascicle, is of interest chiefly for the effort to stimulate the use of local material in education. The criticism of Gobineau's technique as a historian is devastating. His evaluation of sources was unsound; his competence in Persian questionable; his classical training not so good as to keep him from relying mostly on translations for Greek sources; his dependence on secondary works—particularly Grote and, for Alexander, Droysen—great and not always acknowledged. All readers, whether interested in Gobineau or not, will be glad to note the appearance of a new periodical devoted to classical studies.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Det latinske Perfektsystem. By POUL JOHANNES JENSEN. Copenhagen: Munksgaard, 1941. Pp. xv+162. Price not stated.

Already in 1939 (*Classica et mediaevalia*, II, 55–85) Jensen had published a preliminary study on the use of the perfect tense in classical Latin. The present monograph, though it covers much the same ground, is concerned with the use in Cicero *Ad Atticum* i–xii and *De finibus*, from which the material has been fully gathered, less systematically from other works of Cicero, and only incidentally from other writers. This spreads the butter rather thin, especially when “the essential point” of the conclusion is “that the perfect forms . . . always have a perfect meaning.” The problem is, however, more complex and more extensive than this statement suggests; and there is far

more abundant quotation than in the earlier article. For though the perfect indicative, for example, is a syntactical unity, the infinitive (not only in prohibitions of the type *neiquis Bacanal habuisse uolet*, but also much more extensively, e.g., in Persius' *didicisse* [i. 24] or *dictata fuisse* [28]) participating also, morphologically it is a mixture of aorist and perfect forms (of more than one type) and even of middle (*uidi*) and multipersonal forms (*uidere*, note especially the generalizing *partim docuere*, *partim misere* in Lucr. v. 1143, 1310). When the complication of mood is added, and this involves injunctive (*ne attigas: tango, tetigi, abstulas: tollo, tetuli, fuas: sum, fui, ēuenat* [not -tal]: *uenio*, Osc. pf. *kumbened* with *ē*, Skt. aor. *gāmat*), as well as subjunctive and optative, the usage of the perfect becomes anything but simple, even in nondependent clauses, much more so, in Ciceronian Latin, in dependent ones. Not only that: the perfect forms (as distinguished from the aorist) are of varied types,¹ opening the way for further intricacy of aspect. Finally, in the subjunctive and to some extent even the indicative (fut. perf., pluperf.), the tenses are of secondary origin.

But Jensen is more interested in disentangling the facts of use than in tracing origins. For many years I have taught that mood (i.e., subj. and opt.) is subjective in implication, tense (as in the indic.) objective by contrast, formation being essentially the same in principle except in tense-forms developed independently (largely by analogy) and secondarily in a language such as Greek (e.g., aor. opt.) or Latin (e.g., pluperf. subj.). Jensen has reached essentially the same conclusion, that the indicative is the mood of direct statement, while the subjunctive expresses the attitude of the speaker to the thing stated. He leans heavily on Koschmieder's *Zeitbezug und Sprache* for an explanation of the interrelation of aspect and tense ("time-sphere"), both of which play a

part. The aspect is always completed, but the time may be either past or present (*dici* "I have said what I had to say").

Perhaps Jensen's most important contribution (pp. 44 ff.) lies in the clear distinction between conclusive and nonconclusive aspect. This is Jespersen's terminology, but Jensen points out that in Latin the perfect participle of a conclusive verb may be transcribed by a relative clause containing a perfect, whereas "the relative clause which transcribes the perfect of a nonconclusive verb contains a present." He continues: "The conclusive verbs are excluded from the actual present. The two types of verbs are employed with equal facility in the perfect, but if stress is laid on the present, imperfective element, the conclusive verbs have a positive, the nonconclusive a negative meaning," thus *liber a Cicerone scriptus = qui a C. scriptus est*, but *homo spretus = qui spernitur*, and *oppidum expugnatum est*, but *puella iam non amatur*. Hence the so-called "logical perfect" (p. 46), e.g., *Fam. xiv. 4. 5: uiximus, floruitimus*; or Vergil's *fuimus Troes* (which is clearly negative in implication). Jensen argues that the apparent affinity between the future (perfect) and (perfect) subjunctive is due not to a potential-hortatory meaning in forms like *uidero, uideris* but simply to the "vague character of future time." The argument is a little heavy going at times, partly from the bulk of illustrative citation. Actually, a true future tense (i.e. prediction), as distinguished from a verbal anticipation of the course of events based upon the memory of past experience, seems to be a linguistic impossibility, unless, perhaps, in scientific statements, e.g., "Water will boil at 212° F." No wonder if the history and usage of future tense forms (e.g., Eng. *shall, will*) is in great part a history of modal or periphrastic usage of old imperfective and aorist forms.

One very confusing matter, namely, the sequence of tenses after the *perfect*, is brought a little nearer to a logical solution by Jensen's suggestion that instead of using the terms "present" and "aoristic perfect," only "perfect" (i.e., aspect)—in the present or past time, as the case may be—be used.

JOSHUA WHATMOUGH

Harvard University

¹ The assertion, commonly made, that the Latin *u*-perfect is peculiar to that language, is false. There are isolated occurrences of a *u*-element in the perfect in Oscan, Greek, Sanskrit, Old English, Gaulish, Tocharish, and Armenian that seem to give a clue to the starting-point of the developed paradigm in Latin. An investigation of the whole problem is greatly to be desired.

Jensen sticks to the faulty definition of *-ac-* as *inchoative*; it is *progressive*.

The Use of Color in Literature. By SIGMUND SKARD. (*Proceedings of the American Philological Society*, XC, No. 3, 163-249.) Philadelphia, 1946 (1947). Paper, \$1.25; cloth, \$2.00.

This work by the professor of American literature at the University of Oslo consists—aside from its full Index—of two main parts, the first (pp. 163-203) surveying the various methods and problems involved in the study of literary references to color and the second furnishing a bibliography of 1,183 titles, some of them casual allusions in larger works (e.g., Gladstone's *Studies on Homer*), others specialized monographs on some phase of the question. The theme has been approached from the standpoint of general psychology and aesthetics, from semasiology, the history of religion and folklore, the pictorial arts, literary style, the feeling for nature, the interrelation of the arts, and especially from its appearance in particular nations or individual writers. The student of the ancient classics will be most concerned with pages 187-88 and 211-14; but he can hardly fail also to be interested in seeing how the problem has been attacked in authors extending down to the twentieth century. The preference of the ancient epic for brilliance of light, line, and form as against color, and its simple color scale as contrasted with the more refined hues of Euripides, later descriptions of landscapes, and the originality of Ovid as a colorist are but a few of the many interesting topics touched upon. Despite the modesty of the author, who deplors the loss of most of his materials in the bombing of Kobe and the consequent necessity of relying upon a copy of his first draft, any student contemplating a special study in this field, in which there still seem to be unappropriated areas, would find much preliminary ground cleared and gain valuable suggestions from the aims and methods of previous scholars.

ARTHUR STANLEY PEASE

Harvard University

A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C. By MARCUS N. TOD. 2d ed. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1946. Pp. xx+266. 15s.

The first edition of this work, which appeared in 1933, has proved indispensable to students and useful to scholars. The complete exhaustion of the stock occasioned the production of the new edition. There are "a few minor corrections" in the text and ten pages of "Addenda and Corrigenda" at the end of the volume. Those who are acquainted with Tod's reports on "The Progress of Greek Epigraphy" in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* need not be told what a wealth of material is given in these few pages. There are entries under all but four of the ninety-six numbers in the collection; and, in some cases, as on *ostraka* under No. 15 and on the quota-lists under No. 30, the entries are of considerable length.

J. A. O. LARSEN

University of Chicago

Bibliographie archéologique pour les professeurs de langues et d'histoire anciennes. By CHARLES DELVOYE. (*Phoibos: Bulletin du Cercle de philologie classique et orientale de l'Université libre de Bruxelles*, Vol. I.) 1947. Pp. 24.

The purpose of this unpretentious publication is sufficiently indicated by the title. Some 340 items are listed, including several articles. In some cases there are brief comments, not always laudatory. The selection is excellent, though I miss Lawrence's *Classical Sculpture* and Maiuri's larger book on *Herculaneum*; and the arrangement is such that the *Bibliography* is really usable and valuable. American scholars may be surprised at the considerable number of works in Dutch; and they are likely to find several recent books that are otherwise unknown to them.

F. P. JOHNSON

University of Chicago

BOOKS RECEIVED

[Not all works submitted can be reviewed, but those that are sent to the editorial office for notice are regularly listed under "Books Received." Offprints from periodicals and parts of books will not be listed unless they are published (sold) separately. Books submitted are not returnable.]

- AMERICAN NUMISMATIC SOCIETY. *Numismatic Literature*, No. 1, October, 1947. New York: American Numismatic Society, 1947.
- AMERICAN SCHOOL OF CLASSICAL STUDIES AT ATHENS. *Ancient Corinth: A Guide to the Excavations*. 4th ed., rev. and enl. Athens, 1947. Pp. 128.
- BLUCK, R. S. (ed.). *Plato's Seventh and Eighth Letters*. Edited with Introduction and Notes. ("Pitt Press Series.") Cambridge: At the University Press; New York: Macmillan Co., 1947. Pp. viii + 188 + 2 maps. \$1.75.
- BROWN, NORMAN O. *Hermes the Thief: The Evolution of a Myth*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1947. Pp. viii + 164. \$3.00.
- BUTTS, H. R. *The Glorification of Athens in Greek Drama*. ("Iowa Studies in Classical Philology," No. 11.) (Dissertation, State University of Iowa, May, 1942.) Privately printed, 1947. Paper-bound copies at \$4.00 each may be obtained by addressing the author at 305 East Park Avenue, Vandalia, Missouri.
- DAVIDS, MRS. RHYS. *Poems of Cloister and Jungle: A Buddhist Anthology*. London: John Murray; New York: Transatlantic Arts, Inc., 1947. Pp. 128. \$1.25.
- FRISCH, HARTVIG. *The Constitution of the Athenians: A Philological-Historical Analysis of Pseudo-Xenophon's [sic] Treatise De re publica Atheniensium*. (Classica et mediaevalia, "Dissertationes," No. 2.) Copenhagen: Gyldendalske Boghandel, 1942. Pp. 352.
- GEORGIEV, VLADIMIR. *Die sprachliche Zugehörigkeit der Etrusker*. (Offprint from the *Jahrbuch der Universität des Heiligen Kliment von Ochrid in Sofia, historisch-philologische Fakultät*, Vol. XXXIX [1942-43].) Sofia: Universitätsdruckerei, 1943. Pp. 102. 110 levs.
- . *Vorgriechische Sprachwissenschaft*, Lieferung 1. (Offprint from the *Jahrbuch der Universität Sveti Kliment Ohridski in Sofia, historisch-philologische Fakultät*, Vol. XXXVI, H. 6.) Sofia: Universitätsdruckerei, 1941. Pp. 162. 130 levs.
- . *Ibid.*, Lieferung 2. (Offprint from the *Annuaire de l'Université de Sofia, Faculté historico-philologique*, Vol. XLI [1944-45].) Sofia: Imprimerie de l'Université, 1945.
- GERLO, ALOÏS (ed.). *Q. S. Fl. Tertullianus De pallio: Kritische Uitgave met Vertaling en Commentaar*. With a Preface by PAUL VAN DE WOESTIJNE. Vol. I: *Inleiding, Tekst en Vertaling*; Vol. II: *Commentaar*. Wetteren: Uitgeverij De Meester, 1940. Pp. x + 107 + 225.
- German Books: A Selective Critical Bibliography of Publications in German*, Vol. I, No. 1 (January, 1948). Issued five times a year by the Department of Germanic Languages and Literatures at the University of Chicago, Chicago 37, Ill. Annual subscription, \$2.00.
- DE GHELLINCK, J., S.J. *Patristique et Moyen Age: Études d'histoire littéraire et doctrinale*, Vol. II: *Introduction et compléments à l'étude de la patristique*. ("Museum Lessianum," Section historique, No. 7.) Gembloux: J. Duculot; Bruxelles: Édition universelle; Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1947. Pp. xii + 416.
- HENRY, R. (ed. and trans.). *Ctésias, la Perse, l'Inde: Les Sommaires de Photius*. ("Collection Lebègue," Ser. 7, No. 84.) Bruxelles: Office de publicité, S.C., 1947. Pp. 99 + 1 pl. + 1 map. 25 Belgian fr.
- Hermathena*, No. LXX, November, 1947. Dublin: Hodges, Figgis & Co., Ltd.; London: Longmans, Green & Co. 3s.
- HUDSON, HOYT HOPEWELL. *The Epigram in the English Renaissance*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1947. Pp. x + 178. \$2.50.
- INSTITUT FRANÇAIS D'ATHÈNES. *Bulletin analytique de bibliographie hellénique*, Fascs. 1-3 (1946). ("Collection de l'Institut français d'Athènes.") Athens, 1947.
- KOLÁŘ, ANTONIUS. *De re metrica poetarum Graecorum et Romanorum. Accedit de solutae orationis apud Graecos et Romanos eurhythmia appendix. Ministeriis informationum, scholarum eruditionisque publicae, consilio Čecho-*

- slovaco exploratorio adiuvantibus editum est a scriptore Pragae MCMXLVII. Pp. 385. For sale by Nakladatelství Melantrich, Bornova 3, Praha 16, Czechoslovakia.
- LEWIS, C. DAY (trans.). *The Georgics of Virgil*. With an Introduction by LOUIS BROMFIELD. New York: Oxford University Press, 1947. Pp. xviii+83. \$2.50.
- MALKIEL, YAKOV. *Three Hispanic Word Studies: Latin "macula" in Ibero-Romance; Old Portuguese "trigar"; Hispanic "lo(u)cano."* ("University of California Publications in Linguistics," I, No. 7, 227-96.) Berkeley: University of California Press, 1947. \$1.25.
- MAZZARINO, SANTO. *Fra Oriente e Occidente: Ricerche di storia greca arcaica*. ("Il Pensiero storico.") Florence: La nuova Italia, 1947. Pp. viii+412. L. 1200.
- MURPHY, GERARD J. *The Reign of the Emperor L. Septimius Severus from the Evidence of the Inscriptions*. (Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1945.) Jersey City, N. J.: St. Peter's College Press, 1947. Pp. viii+113. \$1.60.
- PARKHURST, CHARLES CHANDLER, and BLAIS, ALICE. *Using Words Effectively*. Series A. New York: Harper & Bros., 1948. Pp. xii+156. \$1.50.
- PRITCHETT, W. KENDRICK, and NEUGEBAUER, O. *The Calendars of Athens*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press (for the American School of Classical Studies at Athens), 1947. Pp. xii+116. \$5.00.
- RIPOSATI, BENEDETTO. *Studi sui 'Topica' di Cicerone*. ("Edizioni dell'Università cattolica del S. Cuore," Pubblicazioni, Vol. XXII.) Milano: Società editrice "Vita e pensiero," 1947. Pp. xvi+338. L. 1100.
- TILLY, BERTHA. *Vergil's Latium*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947. Pp. xvi+123. 15s.
- WAGENVoORT, H. *Roman Dynamism: Studies in Ancient Roman Thought, Language and Custom*. With an Introductory Note by H. J. ROSE. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1947. Pp. xii+214. 15s.
- WEISS, ROBERTO. *The Dawn of Humanism in Italy*. London: H. K. Lewis & Co., Ltd., 1947. Pp. ii+24. 2s. 6d.

BLAIS,
es A.
xii +

ER, O.
rward
ool of
xii +

a' di
tolica
(XII.)
ero,"

Basil

es in
Cus-
I. J.
Pp.

n in
947.